

LENIN ON
WAR AND PEACE

Three Articles



W. J. [unclear] (Linn)

LENIN ON WAR AND PEACE

Three Articles

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1976**

First Edition 1966
Second Printing 1970
Third Printing 1976

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This is a collection of V. I. Lenin's three articles on war and peace. "Socialism and War" has been reprinted from the pamphlet under the same title published in English by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, in 1950; "The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution" from V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, English edition, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2; and "Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism" from V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1936, Vol. V. A few stylistic changes have been made in the present collection.

The notes at the end of the book are largely taken from those given in the Chinese edition, published under the same title by the People's Publishing House, Peking, in July 1964. Some notes given in the English editions mentioned above have also been used.

C-27905

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

SOCIALISM AND WAR

<i>(The Attitude of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party Towards the War)</i>	1
Preface to the First (Foreign) Edition	1
Preface to the Second Edition	3
<i>Chapter I. The Principles of Socialism and the War of 1914-1915</i>	4
The Attitude of Socialists Towards War	4
Historical Types of Wars in Modern Times	5
The Difference Between Aggressive and Defensive War	6
The Present War Is an Imperialist War	7
War Between the Biggest Slave-Owners for Preserving and Fortifying Slavery	8
"War Is the Continuation of Politics by Other" (i.e., Violent) "Means"	11
The Example of Belgium	12
What Is Russia Fighting for?	15
What Is Social-Chauvinism?	14
The Basic Manifesto	15

False References to Marx and Engels	16
The Collapse of the Second International	17
Social-Chauvinism Is Consummated Opportunism	18
Unity with the Opportunists Means Alliance Between the Workers and "Their" National Bourgeoisie and Splitting the International Revolutionary Working Class	19
"Kautskyism"	20
The Marxists' Slogan Is the Slogan of Revolutionary Social- Democracy	22
The Example Shown by the Fraternization in the Trenches	23
The Importance of an Underground Organization	24
Concerning Defeat of "One's Own" Government in the Impe- rialist War	25
Pacifism and the Peace Slogan	25
The Right of Nations to Self-Determination	26
<i>Chapter II. Classes and Parties in Russia</i>	28
The Bourgeoisie and the War	28
The Working Class and the War	30
The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Group in the State Duma and the War	32
<i>Chapter III. The Restoration of the International</i>	37
The Method of the Social-Chauvinists and of the "Centre"	37
The State of Affairs Among the Opposition	39
The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party and the Third International	44
<i>Chapter IV. The History of the Split and the Present State of Social-Democracy in Russia</i>	47
The "Economists" and the Old <i>Iskra</i> (1894-1903)	48
Menshevism and Bolshevism (1903-1908)	49
Marxism and Liquidationism (1908-1914)	50
Marxism and Social-Chauvinism (1914-1915)	52
The Present State of Affairs in Russian Social-Democracy	53
Our Party's Tasks	56

THE WAR PROGRAMME OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION	58
I	58
II	62
III	66
BOURGEOIS PACIFISM AND SOCIALIST PACIFISM	73
Article (or Chapter) I. The Turn in World Politics	73
Article (or Chapter) II. The Pacifism of Kautsky and Turati	79
Article (or Chapter) III. The Pacifism of the French Socialists and Syndicalists	87
Article (or Chapter) IV. Zimmerwald at the Cross-roads	93
NOTES	99

SOCIALISM AND WAR

(THE ATTITUDE OF THE RUSSIAN
SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY
TOWARDS THE WAR)¹

PREFACE TO THE FIRST (FOREIGN) EDITION

The war has been going on for a year already. Our Party defined its attitude towards it at its very beginning, in the Central Committee's manifesto that was drawn up in September 1914 and printed (after it had been sent to the members of the C.C. and to our Party's responsible representatives in Russia, and after their consent had been received) on November 1, 1914, in No. 33 of our Party's Central Organ, *Social-Demokrat*.² Later, in No. 40 (March 29, 1915) were printed the resolutions of the Berne Conference³ in which our principles and tactics were more precisely enunciated.

At the present time, in Russia, there is an obvious growth of revolutionary temper among the masses. In other countries, symptoms of the same phenomenon are observed everywhere, in spite of the suppression of the revolutionary strivings

of the proletariat by the majority of the official Social-Democratic parties, which have taken the side of their governments and their bourgeoisie. This state of things makes particularly urgent the publication of a pamphlet that sums up Social-Democratic tactics in relation to the war. Reprinting in full the above-mentioned Party documents, we provide them with brief explanations, endeavouring to take into account all the chief arguments in favour of bourgeois and of proletarian tactics that have been expressed in literature and at Party meetings.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

This pamphlet was written in the summer of 1915, just before the Zimmerwald Conference.¹ It also appeared in German and French, and was reprinted in full in Norwegian in the organ of the Norwegian Social-Democratic youth league. The German edition of the pamphlet was secretly smuggled into Germany — into Berlin, Leipzig, Bremen and other cities, where it was secretly distributed by supporters of the Zimmerwald Left and by the Karl Liebknecht group. The French edition was secretly printed in Paris and distributed there by the French Zimmerwaldists. The Russian edition reached Russia in a very limited quantity, and in Moscow was copied out by hand by workers.

We are now reprinting this pamphlet in full as a document. The reader must remember all the time that the pamphlet was written in August 1915. This must be remembered particularly in connection with those passages which refer to Russia: Russia at that time was still tsarist, Romanov Russia.

Printed in the 1926 edition of the pamphlet

CHAPTER I
THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM
AND THE WAR OF 1914-1915

THE ATTITUDE OF SOCIALISTS
TOWARDS WARS

Socialists have always condemned war between nations as barbarous and brutal. But our attitude towards war is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the Anarchists. We differ from the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within the country; we understand that war cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and Socialism is created; and we also differ in that we fully regard civil wars, i.e., wars waged by the oppressed class against the oppressing class, slaves against slave-owners, serfs against land-owners, and wage-workers against the bourgeoisie, as legitimate, progressive and necessary. We Marxists differ from both the pacifists and the Anarchists in that we deem it necessary historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) to study each war separately. In history there have been numerous wars which, in spite of all the horrors, atrocities, distress and suffering that inevitably accompany all wars, were progressive, i.e., benefited the development of mankind by helping to destroy the exceptionally harmful and reactionary

institutions (for example, autocracy or serfdom), the most barbarous despotisms in Europe (Turkish and Russian). Therefore, it is necessary to examine the historically specific features of precisely the present war.

HISTORICAL TYPES OF WARS IN MODERN TIMES

The Great French Revolution ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind. From that time to the Paris Commune, from 1789 to 1871, one of the types of wars were wars of a bourgeois-progressive, national-liberating character. In other words, the chief content and historical significance of these wars were the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism, the undermining of these institutions, the overthrow of alien oppression. Therefore, those were progressive wars, and during *such* wars, all honest, revolutionary democrats, and also all Socialists, always sympathized with the success of that country (i.e., with that bourgeoisie), which had helped to overthrow, or sap, the most dangerous foundations of feudalism, absolutism and the oppression of other nations. For example, the revolutionary wars waged by France contained an element of plunder and conquest of alien territory by the French, but this does not in the least alter the fundamental historical significance of these wars, which destroyed and shattered feudalism and absolutism in the whole of old, serf-ridden Europe. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany plundered France, but this does not alter the fundamental historical significance of this war, which liberated tens of millions of German people from feudal disintegration and

from the oppression of two despots, the Russian tsar and Napoleon III

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AGGRESSIVE AND DEFENSIVE WAR

The epoch of 1789-1871 left deep traces and revolutionary memories. Before feudalism, absolutism and alien oppression were overthrown, the development of the proletarian struggle for Socialism was out of the question. When speaking of the legitimacy of "defensive" war in relation to the wars of *such* an epoch, Socialists always had in mind precisely these objects, which amounted to revolution against medievalism and serfdom. By "defensive" war Socialists always meant a '*just*' war in this sense (W. Liebknecht once expressed himself precisely in this way). Only in this sense have Socialists regarded, and now regard, wars "for the defence of the fatherland," or "defensive" wars, as legitimate, progressive and just. For example, if tomorrow, Morocco were to declare war on France, India on England, Persia or China on Russia, and so forth, those would be "just," "defensive" wars, *irrespective* of who attacked first, and every Socialist would sympathize with the victory of the oppressed, dependent, unequal states against the oppressing, slave-owning, predatory "great" powers.

But picture to yourselves a slave-owner who owned 100 slaves warring against a slave-owner who owned 200 slaves for a more "just" distribution of slaves. Clearly, the application of the term "defensive" war, or war "for the defence of the fatherland," in such a case would be historically false, and in practice would be sheer deception of the common peo-

ple, of philistines, of ignorant people, by the astute slave-owners. Precisely in this way are the present-day imperialist bourgeoisie deceiving the peoples by means of "national" ideology and the term "defence of the fatherland" in the present war between slave-owners for fortifying and strengthening slavery.

THE PRESENT WAR IS AN IMPERIALIST WAR

Nearly everybody admits that the present war is an imperialist war, but in most cases this term is distorted or applied to one side, or a loophole is left for the assertion that this war may, after all, have a bourgeois-progressive, national-liberating significance. Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, reached only in the twentieth century. Capitalism now finds the old national states, without the formation of which it could not have overthrown feudalism, too tight for it. Capitalism has developed concentration to such a degree that whole branches of industry have been seized by syndicates, trusts and associations of capitalist billionaires, and almost the entire globe has been divided up among the "lords of capital," either in the form of colonies, or by enmeshing other countries in thousands of threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition have been superseded by the striving for monopoly, for the seizure of territory for the investment of capital, for the export of raw materials from them, and so forth. From the liberator of nations that capitalism was in the struggle against feudalism, imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations. Formerly progressive, capitalism has be-

come reactionary; it has developed the forces of production to such a degree that mankind is faced with the alternative of going over to Socialism or of suffering years and even decades of armed struggle between the "great" powers for the artificial preservation of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges and national oppression of every kind.

WAR BETWEEN THE BIGGEST SLAVE-OWNERS FOR PRESERVING AND FORTIFYING SLAVERY

To explain the significance of imperialism, we will quote exact figures showing the division of the world among the so-called "great" (i.e., successful in great plunder) powers: [See p. 9 - *Ed.*]

From this it is seen how most of the nations which fought at the head of others for freedom in 1849-1871, have now, after 1876, on the basis of highly developed and "overripe" capitalism, become the oppressors and enslavers of the majority of the populations and nations of the globe. From 1876 to 1914, six "great" powers grabbed 25 million sq. kilometres, i.e., an area two and a half times that of Europe! Six powers are enslaving *over half a billion* (523 million) inhabitants of colonies. For every four inhabitants of the "great" powers there are five inhabitants of "their" colonies. And everybody knows that colonies are conquered by fire and sword, that the populations of colonies are brutally treated, that they are exploited in a thousand ways (by exporting capital, concessions, etc., cheating when selling them goods, subordination to the authorities of the "ruling" nation, and

Division of the World Among the "Great" Slave-owning Powers

[illegible]

so on and so forth). The Anglo-French bourgeoisie are deceiving the people when they say that they are waging war for the freedom of nations and for Belgium; actually they are waging war for the purpose of retaining the colonies they have inordinately grabbed. The German imperialists would free Belgium, etc., at once if the British and French would agree "fairly" to share their colonies with them. The peculiarity of the situation lies in that in this war the fate of the colonies is being decided by war on the Continent. From the standpoint of bourgeois justice and national freedom (or the right of nations to existence), Germany would be absolutely right as against England and France, for she has been "done out" of colonies, her enemies are oppressing an immeasurably far larger number of nations than she is, and the Slavs who are oppressed by her ally Austria undoubtedly enjoy far more freedom than those in tsarist Russia, that real "prison of nations." But Germany is fighting not for the liberation, but for the oppression of nations. It is not the business of Socialists to help the younger and stronger robber (Germany) to rob the older and overgorged robbers. Socialists must take advantage of the struggle between the robbers to overthrow them all. To be able to do this, the Socialists must first of all tell the people the truth, namely, that this war is in a treble sense a war between slave-owners to fortify slavery. This is a war firstly, to fortify the enslavement of the colonies by means of a "fairer" distribution and subsequent more "concerted" exploitation of them; secondly, to fortify the oppression of other nations within the "great" powers, for *both* Austria *and* Russia (Russia more and much worse than Austria) maintain their rule only by such oppression, intensifying it by means of war; and thirdly, to fortify and prolong wage slavery, for the proletariat is

split up and suppressed, while the capitalists gain, making fortunes out of the war, aggravating national prejudices and intensifying reaction, which has raised its head in all countries, even in the freest and most republican.

**"WAR IS THE CONTINUATION OF
POLITICS BY OTHER"
(i.e., VIOLENT) "MEANS"**⁵

This famous aphorism was uttered by one of the profoundest writers on the problems of war, Clausewitz. Marxists have always rightly regarded this thesis as the theoretical basis of views concerning the significance of every given war. It was precisely from this viewpoint that Marx and Engels always regarded different wars.

Apply this view to the present war. You will see that for decades, for almost half a century, the governments and the ruling classes of England, and France, and Germany, and Italy, and Austria, and Russia, pursued a policy of plundering colonies, of oppressing other nations, of suppressing the working-class movement. It is this, and only this policy that is being continued in the present war. In particular, the policy of both Austria and Russia, in peace-time as well as in war-time, is a policy of enslaving and not of liberating nations. In China, Persia, India and other dependent countries, on the contrary, we have seen during the past decades a policy of rousing tens and hundreds of millions of people to national life, of liberating them from the oppression of the reactionary "great" powers. A war on such a historical ground can even today be a bourgeois-progressive, national-liberation war.

It is sufficient to glance at the present war from the viewpoint that it is a continuation of the politics of the "great" powers, and of the principal classes within them, to see at once the howling anti-historicalness, falsity and hypocrisy of the view that the "defence of the fatherland" idea can be justified in the present war.

THE EXAMPLE OF BELGIUM

The favourite plea of the social-chauvinist triple (now quadruple) entente (in Russia, Plekhanov and Co.), is the example of Belgium. But this example goes against them. The German imperialists shamelessly violated the neutrality of Belgium, as belligerent states have done always and everywhere, trampling upon *all* treaties and obligations if necessary. Let us suppose that all the states interested in the observation of international treaties declared war on Germany with the demand for the liberation and indemnification of Belgium. In such a case, the sympathies of Socialists would, of course, be on the side of Germany's enemies. But the whole point is that the "triple (and quadruple) entente" is waging war *not* over Belgium: this is perfectly well known, and only hypocrites conceal this. England is grabbing Germany's colonies and Turkey; Russia is grabbing Galicia and Turkey, France wants Alsace-Lorraine and even the left bank of the Rhine; a treaty has been concluded with Italy for the division of the spoils (Albania, Asia Minor); bargaining is going on with Bulgaria and Rumania, also for the division of the spoils. In the present war waged by the present governments it is *impossible* to help Belgium *without* helping to strangle Austria or Turkey, etc.) How does "defence of the

fatherland" come in here? Herein, precisely, lies the specific feature of imperialist war, war between reactionary-bourgeois, historically obsolete governments, waged for the purpose of oppressing other nations. Whoever justifies participation in the present war perpetuates imperialist oppression of nations. Whoever advocates taking advantage of the present embarrassments of the governments to fight for the social revolution champions the real freedom of really all nations, which is possible only under Socialism.

WHAT IS RUSSIA FIGHTING FOR?

In Russia, capitalist imperialism of the latest type has fully revealed itself in the policy of tsarism towards Persia, Manchuria and Mongolia; but, in general, military and feudal imperialism predominates in Russia. In no country in the world is the majority of the population oppressed so much as it is in Russia; Great Russians constitute only 43 per cent of the population, i.e., less than half; all the rest are denied rights as aliens. Of the 170 million inhabitants of Russia, *about 100 million* are oppressed and denied rights. Tsarism is waging war to seize Galicia and finally to crush the liberties of the Ukrainians, to seize Armenia, Constantinople, etc. Tsarism regards the war as a means of diverting attention from the growth of discontent within the country and of suppressing the growing revolutionary movement. At the present time, for every two Great Russians in Russia there are from two to three rightless "aliens": tsarism is striving by means of the war to increase the number of nations oppressed by Russia, to perpetuate this oppression and thereby undermine the struggle for freedom which the Great Rus-

sians themselves are waging. The possibility of oppressing and robbing other nations perpetuates economic stagnation, because, often, the source of income is not the development of productive forces, but the semi-feudal exploitation of "aliens." Thus, on the part of Russia, the war is distinguished for its profoundly reactionary and anti-liberating character.

WHAT IS SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM?

Social-chauvinism is advocacy of the idea of "defence of the fatherland" in the present war. Further, this idea logically leads to the abandonment of the class struggle during the war, to voting war credits, etc. Actually, the social-chauvinists are pursuing an anti-proletarian, bourgeois policy; for actually, they are championing not "defence of the fatherland" in the sense of fighting foreign oppression, but the "right" of one or other of the "great" powers to plunder colonies and to oppress other nations. The social-chauvinists repeat the bourgeois deception of the people that the war is being waged to protect the freedom and existence of nations, and thereby they go over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. In the category of social-chauvinists are those who justify and embellish the governments and bourgeoisie of *one* of the belligerent groups of powers, as well as those who, like Kautsky, argue that the Socialists of *all* the belligerent powers have an equal right to "defend the fatherland." Social-chauvinism, being actually defence of the privileges, advantages, robbery and violence of one's "own" (or every) imperialist bourgeoisie, is the utter betrayal of all socialist convictions and of the decision of the Basle International Socialist Congress.

THE BASLE MANIFESTO⁶

The manifesto on war that was unanimously adopted in Basle in 1912 had in view the very war between England and Germany and their present allies that broke out in 1914. The manifesto openly declares that no plea of the interests of the people can justify such a war, waged "for the sake of the profits of the capitalists" and "the ambitions of dynasties" on the basis of the imperialist, predatory policy of the great powers. The manifesto openly declares that war is dangerous "for the governments" (all without exception), notes their fear of "a proletarian revolution," and very definitely points to the example of the Commune of 1871, and of October-December 1905, *i.e., to the examples of revolution and civil war*. Thus, the Basle Manifesto lays down, precisely for the present war, the tactics of revolutionary struggle by the workers on an international scale against their governments, the tactics of proletarian revolution. The Basle Manifesto repeats the statement in the Stuttgart resolution that, in the event of war breaking out, Socialists must take advantage of the "economic and political crisis" it will cause, to "hasten the downfall of capitalism," *i.e., to take advantage of the governments' embarrassments and the anger of the masses, caused by the war, for the socialist revolution*.

The policy of the social-chauvinists, their justification of the war from the bourgeois-liberation standpoint, their sanctioning of "defence of the fatherland," voting credits, entering cabinets, and so on and so forth, is downright treachery to Socialism, which can be explained only, as we will see lower down, by the victory of opportunism and of the national-liberal labour policy in the majority of European parties.

FALSE REFERENCES TO MARX AND ENGELS

The Russian social-chauvinists (headed by Plekhanov), refer to Marx's tactics in the war of 1870, the German (of the type of Lensch, David and Co) to Engels' statement in 1891 that in the event of war against Russia and France together, it would be the duty of the German Socialists to defend their fatherland, and lastly, the social-chauvinists of the Kautsky type, who want to reconcile and legitimize international chauvinism, refer to the fact that Marx and Engels, while condemning war, nevertheless, constantly, from 1854-1855 to 1870-1871 and 1876-1877, took the side of one or another belligerent state once war had broken out.

All these references are outrageous distortions of the views of Marx and Engels in the interest of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, in just the same way as the writings of the Anarchists Guillaume and Co distort the views of Marx and Engels in justification of anarchism. The war of 1870-1871 was a historically progressive war on the part of Germany until Napoleon III was defeated, for the latter, together with the tsar, had oppressed Germany for many years, keeping her in a state of feudal disintegration. But as soon as the war developed into the plunder of France (the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine), Marx and Engels emphatically condemned the Germans. And even at the beginning of that war Marx and Engels approved of the refusal of Bebel and Liebknecht to vote for credits and advised the Social-Democrats not to merge with the bourgeoisie, but to uphold the independent class interests of the proletariat. To apply the appraisal of this bourgeois-progressive and national-liberating war to the present imperialist war means mocking at truth.

The same applies with still greater force to the war of 1854-1855, and to all the wars of the nineteenth century, when there was *no* modern imperialism, *no* ripe objective conditions for Socialism, and *no* mass Socialist parties *in any* of the belligerent countries, i.e., none of the conditions from which the Basle Manifesto deduced the tactics of "proletarian revolution" *in connection* with a war between the great powers.

Whoever refers today to Marx's attitude towards the wars of the epoch of the *progressive* bourgeoisie and forgets Marx's statement that "the workers have no fatherland," a statement that applies *precisely* to the epoch of the reactionary, obsolete bourgeoisie, to the epoch of the socialist revolution, shamelessly distorts Marx and substitutes the bourgeois for the socialist point of view.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

The Socialists of all the world solemnly declared in Basle, in 1912, that they regarded the impending war in Europe as the "criminal" and most reactionary affair of *all* the governments, which must hasten the downfall of capitalism by inevitably calling forth a revolution against it. The war came, the crisis came. Instead of revolutionary tactics, the majority of the Social-Democratic parties conducted reactionary tactics, went over to the side of their respective governments and bourgeoisie. This betrayal of Socialism signifies the collapse of the Second (1889-1914) International, and we must understand what caused this collapse, what brought social-chauvinism into being, what gave it strength.

SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM IS CONSUMMATED OPPORTUNISM

During the whole epoch of the Second International, a struggle raged everywhere in the Social-Democratic parties between the revolutionary and the opportunist wings. In a number of countries a split has taken place along this line (England, Italy, Holland, Bulgaria). Not a single Marxist has any doubt that opportunism expresses bourgeois policy within the working-class movement, expresses the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the alliance of a tiny section of bourgeoisified workers with "*their*" bourgeoisie against the interests of the proletarian masses, the oppressed masses.

The objective conditions of the end of the nineteenth century exceptionally intensified opportunism, converted the utilization of bourgeois legality into subservience to it, created a tiny stratum of bureaucrats and aristocrats within the working class, and drew into the ranks of the Social-Democratic parties numerous petty-bourgeois "fellow travelers."

The war accelerated this development and transformed opportunism into social-chauvinism, transformed the secret alliance between the opportunists and the bourgeoisie into an open one. Simultaneously, the military authorities everywhere have introduced martial law and have muzzled the mass of the workers, whose old leaders have nearly all gone over to the bourgeoisie.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same economic basis: the interests of a tiny stratum of privileged workers and of the petty bourgeoisie who are defending their privileged position, their "right" to crumbs of the profits "their" national bourgeoisie obtain from robbing other na-

tions, from the advantages of their position as the ruling nation, etc.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same ideological-political content: collaboration of classes instead of class struggle, renunciation of revolutionary methods of struggle, helping one's "own" government in its embarrassed situation instead of taking advantage of these embarrassments for revolution. If we take all the European countries as a whole, if we pay attention not to individuals (even the most authoritative), we will find that it is the opportunist *trend* that has become the chief bulwark of social-chauvinism, whereas from the camp of the revolutionaries, more or less consistent protests against it are heard nearly everywhere. And if we take, for example, the grouping of trends at the Stuttgart International Socialist Congress in 1907,¹ we will find that international Marxism was opposed to imperialism, while international opportunism was in favour of it already at that time.

UNITY WITH THE OPPORTUNISTS MEANS
ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE WORKERS AND
"THEIR" NATIONAL BOURGEOISIE
AND SPLITTING THE INTERNATIONAL
REVOLUTIONARY WORKING CLASS

In the past epoch, before the war, although opportunism was often regarded as a "deviationist," "extremist" part of the Social-Democratic Party, it was nevertheless regarded as a legitimate part. The war has shown that this cannot be so in future. Opportunism has "matured," is now playing to the full its role as emissary of the bourgeois in the

working-class movement. Unity with the opportunists has become sheer hypocrisy, an example of which we see in the German Social-Democratic Party. On all important occasions (for example, the voting on August 4),⁸ the opportunists come forward with an ultimatum, which they carry out with the aid of their numerous connections with the bourgeoisie, of their majority on the executives of the trade unions, etc. *Unity* with the opportunists *actually* means today, subordinating the working class to "its" national bourgeoisie, alliance with it for the purpose of oppressing other nations and of fighting for great-power privileges, it means *splitting* the revolutionary proletariat in all countries.

Hard as the struggle may be, in individual cases, against the opportunists who predominate in many organizations, peculiar as the process of purging the workers' parties of opportunists may be in individual countries, this process is inevitable and fruitful. Reformist Socialism is dying; regenerated Socialism "will be revolutionary, uncompromising and insurrectionary," to use the apt expression of the French Socialist Paul Golay.

"KAUTSKYISM"

Kautsky, the biggest authority in the Second International, gives us a highly typical and glaring example of how the verbal recognition of Marxism has led actually to its conversion into "Struveism,"⁹ or into "Brentanoism."¹⁰ We see this also from the example of Plekhanov. By means of obvious sophistry they rob Marxism of its revolutionary living spirit; they recognize *everything* in Marxism *except* revolutionary methods of struggle, the preaching of and preparation for such

methods, and the training of the masses precisely in this direction. Kautsky, in an unprincipled fashion, "reconciles" the fundamental idea of social-chauvinism, recognition of defence of the fatherland in the present war, with a diplomatic, sham concession to the Lefts in the shape of abstaining from voting credits, the verbal claim of being in the opposition, etc. Kautsky, who in 1909 wrote a whole book on the approaching epoch of revolutions and on the connection between war and revolutions, Kautsky, who in 1912 signed the Basle Manifesto on taking revolutionary advantage of the impending war, is now, in every way, justifying and embellishing social-chauvinism and, like Plekhanov, joins the bourgeoisie in ridiculing all thought of revolution, all steps towards direct revolutionary struggle.

The working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this renegacy, spinelessness, subservience to opportunism and unexampled vulgarization of the theories of Marxism. Kautskyism is not a fortuity, but a social product of the contradictions within the Second International, a combination of loyalty to Marxism in words and subordination to opportunism in deeds.

This fundamental falseness of "Kautskyism" manifests itself in different ways in different countries. In Holland, Roland-Holst, while rejecting the idea of defending the fatherland, defends unity with the opportunists' party. In Russia, Trotsky, while also rejecting this idea, also defends unity with the opportunist and chauvinist *Nasba Zarya* group. In Rumania, Rakovsky, while declaring war on opportunism as being responsible for the collapse of the International, is at the same time ready to recognize the legitimacy of the idea of defending the fatherland. All this is a manifestation of

the evil which the Dutch Marxists (Gorter and Pannekoek) have called "passive radicalism," and which amounts to substituting for Marxism eclecticism in theory and servility to, or impotence in the face of, opportunism in practice

THE MARXISTS' SLOGAN IS THE SLOGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

The war has undoubtedly created a most acute crisis and has increased the distress of the masses to an incredible degree. The reactionary character of this war, and the shameless lies told by the bourgeoisie of *all* countries in covering up their predatory aims with "national" ideology, are inevitably creating, on the basis of an objectively revolutionary situation, revolutionary moods among the masses. It is our duty to help the masses to become conscious of these moods, to deepen and formulate them. This task is correctly expressed only by the slogan: convert the imperialist war into civil war, and *all* consistently waged class struggles during the war, all seriously conducted "mass action" tactics inevitably lead to this. It is impossible to foretell whether a powerful revolutionary movement will flare up during the first or the second war of the great powers, whether during or after it, in any case, our bounden duty is systematically and undeviatingly to work precisely in this direction.

The Basle Manifesto refers directly to the example set by the Paris Commune, i.e., to the conversion of a war between governments into civil war. Half a century ago, the proletariat was too weak, the objective conditions for Socialism had not yet ripened, there could be no coordination and

cooperation between the revolutionary movements in all the belligerent countries; the "national ideology" (the traditions of 1792), with which a section of the Parisian workers were imbued, was their petty-bourgeois weakness, which Marx noted at the time, and was one of the causes of the fall of the Commune. Half a century after it, the conditions that weakened the revolution at that time have passed away, and it is unpardonable for a Socialist at the present time to resign himself to the abandonment of activities precisely in the spirit of the Paris Communards.

THE EXAMPLE SHOWN BY THE FRATERNIZATION IN THE TRENCHES

The bourgeois newspapers of all the belligerent countries have reported cases of fraternization between the soldiers of the belligerent nations even in the trenches. And the issue by the military authorities (of Germany, England) of draconic orders against such fraternization proved that the governments and the bourgeoisie attached grave importance to it. The fact that such cases of fraternization have been possible even when opportunism reigns supreme in the top ranks of the Social-Democratic parties of Western Europe, and when social-chauvinism is supported by the entire Social-Democratic press and by all the authorities of the Second International, shows us how possible it would be to shorten the present criminal, reactionary and slave-owners' war and to organize a revolutionary international movement, if systematic work were conducted in this direction, if only by the Left-wing Socialists in all the belligerent countries.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AN UNDERGROUND ORGANIZATION

The most prominent Anarchists all over the world, no less than the opportunists, have disgraced themselves with social-chauvinism (in the spirit of Plekhanov and Kautsky) in this war. One of the useful results of this war will undoubtedly be that it will kill both anarchism and opportunism.

While under no circumstances or conditions refraining from utilizing all legal possibilities, however small, for the purpose of organizing the masses and of preaching Socialism, the Social-Democratic parties must break with subservience to legality. "You shoot first, Messieurs the Bourgeoisie,"¹¹ wrote Engels, hinting precisely at civil war and at the necessity of our violating legality *after* the bourgeoisie had violated it. The crisis has shown that the bourgeoisie violate it in all countries, even the freest, and that it is impossible to lead the masses to revolution unless an underground organization is set up for the purpose of advocating, discussing, appraising and preparing revolutionary methods of struggle. In Germany, for example, all the *bonest* things that Socialists are doing, are being done in spite of despicable opportunism and hypocritical "Kautskyism," and are being done secretly. In England, people are sent to penal servitude for printing appeals against joining the army.

To regard the repudiation of underground methods of propaganda, and ridiculing the latter in the legally published press, as being compatible with membership of the Social-Democratic Party is treachery to Socialism.

CONCERNING DEFEAT OF "ONE'S OWN" GOVERNMENT IN THE IMPERIALIST WAR

Both the advocates of victory for their governments in the present war and the advocates of the slogan "neither victory nor defeat," equally take the standpoint of social-chauvinism. A revolutionary class cannot but wish for the defeat of its government in a reactionary war, cannot fail to see that its military reverses facilitate its overthrow. Only a bourgeois who believes that a war started by the governments must necessarily end as a war between governments and wants it to end as such, can regard as "ridiculous" and "absurd" the idea that the Socialists of *all* the belligerent countries should wish for the defeat of *all* "their" governments and express this wish. On the contrary, it is precisely a statement of this kind that would conform to the cherished thoughts of every class-conscious worker, and would be in line with our activities towards converting the imperialist war into civil war.

Undoubtedly, the serious anti-war agitation that is being conducted by a section of the British, German and Russian Socialists has "weakened the military power" of the respective governments, but such agitation stands to the credit of the Socialists. Socialists must explain to the masses that they have no other road of salvation except the revolutionary overthrow of "their" governments, and that advantage must be taken of these governments' embarrassments in the present war precisely for this purpose.

PACIFISM AND THE PEACE SLOGAN

The sentiments of the masses in favour of peace often express incipient protest, anger and consciousness of the reac-

tionary character of the war. It is the duty of all Social-Democrats to utilize these sentiments. They will take a most ardent part in every movement and in every demonstration on this ground; but they will not deceive the people by conceding the idea that peace without annexations, without the oppression of nations, without plunder, without the germs of new wars among the present governments and ruling classes is possible in the absence of a revolutionary movement. Such a deception of the people would merely play into the hands of the secret diplomacy of the belligerent governments and facilitate their counter-revolutionary plans. Whoever wants a lasting and democratic peace must be in favour of civil war against the governments and the bourgeoisie.

THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION

The most widespread deception of the people perpetrated by the bourgeoisie in the present war is the concealment of its predatory aims with "national-liberation" ideology. The English promise the liberation of Belgium, the Germans of Poland, etc. Actually, as we have seen, this is a war waged by the oppressors of the majority of the nations of the world for the purpose of fortifying and expanding such oppression.

Socialists cannot achieve their great aim without fighting against all oppression of nations. Therefore, they must without fail demand that the Social-Democratic parties of *oppressing* countries (especially of the so-called "great" powers) should recognize and champion the right of *oppressed* nations to self-determination, precisely in the political sense of the term, i.e., the right to political secession. The So-

cialist of a ruling or colony-owning nation who fails to champion this right is a chauvinist.

The championing of this right, far from encouraging the formation of small states, leads, on the contrary, to the freer, fearless and therefore wider and more widespread formation of very big states and federations of states, which are more beneficial for the masses and more fully in keeping with economic development.

The Socialists of *oppressed* nations must, in their turn, unfailingly fight for the complete (including organizational) unity of the *workers* of the oppressed and oppressing nationalities. The idea of the juridical separation of one nation from another (so-called "cultural-national autonomy" advocated by Bauer and Renner) is reactionary.

Imperialism is the epoch of the constantly increasing oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of "great" powers and, therefore, it is impossible to fight for the socialist international revolution against imperialism unless the right of nations to self-determination is recognized. "No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations" (Marx and Engels). A proletariat that tolerates the slightest violence by "its" nation against other nations cannot be a socialist proletariat.

CHAPTER II

CLASSES AND PARTIES IN RUSSIA

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE WAR

In one respect, the Russian government has not lagged behind its European confrères; like them, it has succeeded in deceiving "its" people on a grand scale. A huge, monstrous machine of falsehood and cunning was set going in Russia too for the purpose of infecting the masses with chauvinism, of creating the impression that the tsarist government is waging a "just" war, that it is disinterestedly defending its "brother Slavs," etc.

The landlord class and the upper stratum of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie ardently supported the tsarist government's bellicose policy. They are rightly expecting enormous material gains and privileges for themselves out of the partition of the Turkish and the Austrian legacy. A whole series of their congresses already have a foretaste of the profits that would flow into their pockets if the tsarist army were victorious. Moreover, the reactionaries are very well aware that if anything can postpone the downfall of the Romanov monarchy and delay the new revolution in Russia, it can only be a foreign war that ends in victory for the tsar.

Broad strata of the urban "middle" bourgeoisie, of the bourgeois intelligentsia, professional people, etc., were also

infected with chauvinism — at all events at the beginning of the war. The Cadets — the party of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie — wholly and unreservedly supported the tsarist government. In the sphere of foreign policy the Cadets have long been a government party. Pan-Slavism — with the aid of which tsarist diplomacy has more than once carried out its grand political swindles — has become the official ideology of the Cadets. Russian liberalism has degenerated into *national* liberalism. It is vying in "patriotism" with the Black Hundreds; it always willingly votes for militarism, navalism, etc. In the camp of Russian liberalism, approximately the same thing is observed as was seen in the 70's in Germany when "free-thinking" liberalism decayed and from it arose a national-liberal party. The Russian liberal bourgeoisie has definitely taken the path of counter-revolution. The point of view of the R.S.D.L.P. on this question has been fully confirmed. Life has shattered the view held by our opportunists that Russian liberalism is still a motive force of the revolution in Russia.

Among the peasantry, the ruling clique, with the aid of the bourgeois press, the clergy, etc., also succeeded in rousing chauvinist sentiments. But, as the soldiers return from the field of slaughter, sentiment in the rural districts will undoubtedly turn against the tsarist monarchy. The bourgeois-democratic parties that come in contact with the peasantry failed to withstand the chauvinist wave. The Trudovik party in the State Duma refused to vote for war credits; but through the mouth of its leader Kerensky it made a "patriotic" declaration which played extremely well into the hands of the monarchy. The entire legally published press of the "Narodniks" in general, trailed behind the liberals. Even the Left-wing of bourgeois democracy — the

so-called Socialist-Revolutionary Party, which is affiliated to the International Socialist Bureau — floated in the same stream. Mr Rubanovich, that party's representative on the I S B, comes out as an open social-chauvinist. Half of this party's delegates at the London Conference of "Entente" Socialists voted for a chauvinist resolution (while the other half abstained from voting). In the illegally published press of the Socialist-Revolutionaries (the newspaper *Novosti*¹² and others) chauvinists predominate. The revolutionaries from bourgeois circles," i.e., the bourgeois revolutionaries not connected with the working class, have suffered utter bankruptcy in this war. The sad fate of Kropotkin, Burtsev and Rubanovich is extremely significant.

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE WAR

The only class in Russia that they did not succeed in infecting with chauvinism is the proletariat. Only the most ignorant strata of the workers were involved in the few excesses that occurred at the beginning of the war. The part played by workers in the Moscow anti-German riots was greatly exaggerated. In general, and on the whole, the working class of Russia proved to be immune to chauvinism.

This is to be explained by the revolutionary situation in the country and by the general conditions of life of the Russian proletariat.

The years 1912-1914 marked the beginning of a new, grand revolutionary upswing in Russia. We again witnessed a great strike movement such as the world has not known. The number involved in the mass revolutionary strike in 1913 was, at the very lowest estimation, one and a half

million and in 1914 it rose above two million and drew near to the level of 1905. On the eve of the war, in St. Petersburg things had already developed to the first barricade battles.

The underground Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party performed its duty to the International to the full. The banner of internationalism did not falter in its hands. Our Party had broken organizationally with the opportunist groups and elements long ago, its feet were not weighted with the fetters of opportunism and of "legalism at any price," and this circumstance helped it to perform its revolutionary duty — just as the break-away from Bissolati's opportunist party helped the Italian comrades too.

The general situation in our country is inimical to the efflorescence of "socialist" opportunism among the masses of the workers. In Russia we see a whole series of shades of opportunism and reformism among the intelligentsia, the petty bourgeoisie, etc., but it constitutes an insignificant minority among the politically active strata of the workers. The privileged stratum of workers and office employees in our country is very weak. The fetishism of legality could not be created here. The Liquidators (the party of the opportunists led by Axelrod, Potressov, Cherevanin, Maslov, and others) found no serious support among the masses of the workers before the war. The elections to the Fourth State Duma resulted in the return of *all* the six anti-liquidator worker deputies. The circulation of and collection of funds for the legally published workers' press in Petrograd and Moscow have proved irrefutably that four-fifths of the class-conscious workers are opposed to opportunism and liquidationism.

Since the beginning of the war the tsarist government has arrested and exiled thousands and thousands of advanced workers, members of our underground R.S.D.L.P. This circumstance, together with the introduction of martial law in the country, the suppression of our newspapers, and so forth, has retarded the movement. But for all that, our Party is continuing its underground revolutionary activities. In Petrograd, the committee of our Party is publishing the underground newspaper *Proletarsky Golos*.¹³

Articles from the Central Organ *Sotsial-Demokrat*, published abroad, are reprinted in Petrograd and sent out to the provinces. Manifestoes are secretly printed and circulated even in soldiers' barracks. In various secluded places outside the city, secret workers' meetings are held. Lately big strikes of metal workers have begun in Petrograd. In connection with these strikes our Petrograd Committee has issued several appeals to the workers.

THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR GROUP IN THE STATE DUMA AND THE WAR

In 1913 a split occurred among the Social-Democratic deputies in the State Duma. On one side were the seven supporters of opportunism led by Chkheidze. They were elected for the seven non-proletarian gubernias* where the workers numbered 214,000. On the other side were six deputies, all from workers' curiae, elected for the most industrialized centres in Russia, in which the workers numbered 1,008,000.

The chief issue in the split was: the tactics of revolutionary Marxism or the tactics of opportunist reformism? In

* Provinces.

practice, the disagreement manifested itself mainly in the sphere of work *outside* of parliament among the masses. In Russia this work had to be conducted secretly if those conducting it wanted to remain on revolutionary ground. The Chkhaidze group remained a faithful ally of the Liquidators who repudiated underground work, and defended them in all talks with the workers, at all meetings. Hence the split. The six deputies formed the R.S.D.L. group. The year's work has shown irrefutably that this is the group that the overwhelming majority of the Russian workers supports.

On the outbreak of the war the disagreement stood out in glaring relief. The Chkhaidze group confined itself to parliamentary action. It did not vote for credits, for had it done so it would have roused against itself a storm of indignation among the workers. (We have seen that in Russia even the petty-bourgeois Trudoviki did not vote for credits); but it did not utter a protest against social-chauvinism either.

The R.S.D.L. group, expressing the political line of our Party, acted differently. It carried into the very depths of the working class a protest against the war; it conducted anti-imperialist propaganda among the broad masses of the Russian proletarians.

And it met with a very sympathetic response among the workers — which frightened the government and compelled it, in flagrant violation of its own laws, to arrest our comrades, the deputies, and to sentence them to lifelong exile in Siberia. In its very first official announcement of the arrest of our comrades the tsarist government wrote:

"An entirely exceptional position in this respect was taken by some members of Social-Democratic societies, the object of whose activities was to shake the military might of Russia

by agitating against the war by means of underground appeals and verbal propaganda."

In response to Vandervelde's well-known appeal "temporarily" to stop the struggle against tsarism — it has now become known from the evidence of Prince Kudashev, the tsar's envoy in Belgium, that Vandervelde did not draw up this appeal alone, but in collaboration with the above-mentioned tsar's envoy — *only* our Party, through its Central Committee, replied in the negative. The guiding centre of the Liquidators agreed with Vandervelde and officially stated in the press that "in its activities it will *not counteract the war.*"

The tsarist government's primary charge against our comrades, the deputies, was that they propagated this negative answer to Vandervelde among the workers.

At the trial, the tsarist Prosecutor, Mr. Nenarokomov, set up the German and French Socialists as examples for our comrades. "The German Social-Democrats," he said, "voted for the war credits and proved to be the friends of the government. That is how the German Social-Democrats acted, but the dismal knights of Russian Social-Democracy did not act in this way. . . . The Socialists of Belgium and France unanimously forgot their quarrels with other classes, forgot party strife and unhesitatingly rallied round the flag." But the members of the R.S.D.L. group, obeying the instructions of the Central Committee of the Party, did not act in this way, he said. . . .

The trial unfolded an imposing picture of the extensive, underground anti-war agitation our Party was conducting among the masses of the proletariat. It goes without saying that the tsarist court did not by a very long way "reveal" all the activities our comrades were conducting in this sphere;

but even what was revealed showed how much had been done within the short space of a few months

At the trial the secret manifestoes issued by our groups and committees against the war and for international tactics were read. Threads stretched from the class-conscious workers all over Russia to the members of the R S D L group, and the latter did all in its power to help the workers to appraise the war from the standpoint of Marxism

Comrade Muranov, the deputy of the workers of the Kharkov Gubernia, said at the trial

Understanding that the people did not send me into the State Duma for the purpose of wearing out the seat of a Duma armchair, I travelled about the country to ascertain the mood of the working class ' He admitted at the trial that he took upon himself the function of a secret agitator of our Party, that in the Urals he organized a workers' committee at the Verkhneisetsky Works, and in other places. The trial showed that after the war broke out members of the R S D L group travelled through almost the whole of Russia for propaganda purposes, that Muranov, Petrovsky, Badayev and others arranged numerous workers' meetings, at which anti-war resolutions were passed, and so forth

The tsarist government threatened the accused with capital punishment. Owing to this, not all of them behaved at the actual trial as bravely as Comrade Muranov. They tried to make it difficult for the tsarist prosecutors to secure their conviction. The Russian social-chauvinists are now meanly utilizing this to obscure the essence of the question: what kind of parliamentarism does the working class need?

Parliamentarism is recognized by Sudekum and Heine, Sembat and Vaillant, Bissolati and Mussolini, Chkheidze and Plekhanov, and parliamentarism is recognized by our

comrades in the R.S.D.L. Duma group; it is recognized by the Bulgarian and Italian comrades who have broken with the chauvinists. There are different kinds of parliamentarism. Some utilize the parliamentary arena in order to win the favour of their governments, or, at best, to wash their hands of everything, like the Chkheidze group. Others utilize parliamentarism in order to remain revolutionary to the end, to perform their duty as Socialists and internationalists even under the most difficult circumstances. The parliamentary activities of some bring them into ministerial seats; the parliamentary activities of others bring them — to prison, to exile, to penal servitude. Some serve the bourgeoisie, others — the proletariat. Some are social-imperialists. Others are revolutionary Marxists.

CHAPTER III

THE RESTORATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL

How should the International be restored? But first, a few words about how the International *should not be* restored.

THE METHOD OF THE SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS AND OF THE "CENTRE"

Oh, the social-chauvinists of all countries are big "internationalists"! Since the very beginning of the war they have been burdened with care for the International. On the one hand, they assure us that the talk about the *collapse* of the International is "exaggerated." Actually, nothing exceptional has occurred. Listen to Kautsky: simply, the International is a "peacetime instrument"; naturally, this instrument was found to be somewhat not up to the mark in wartime. On the other hand, the social-chauvinists of all countries have found a very simple — and chiefly, an international — way out of the situation that has arisen. A simple way out: it is only necessary to wait until the war ends; but until the war ends the Socialists of each country must defend their "fatherland" and support "their" government; when the war ends — mutual "amnesty," admission that *everybody* was right, that in peacetime we live like brothers, but in wartime we

— on the basis of such and such resolutions — call upon the German workers to exterminate their French brothers, and vice versa.

On this Kautsky and Plekhanov and Victor Adler and Heine are equally agreed. Victor Adler writes that “when we have passed through this hard time, our first duty will be to refrain from pointing to the mote in each other’s eye.” Kautsky asserts that “up till now no voices of serious Socialists have been heard from any side that rouse apprehensions” concerning the fate of the International. Plekhanov says that “it is unpleasant to grasp the hands (of the German Social-Democrats) ‘that reek of the blood of the innocently killed.’” But he at once goes on to propose an “amnesty” “here it will be quite appropriate,” he writes, “to subordinate *the heart to the mind*. For the sake of the great cause, the International will have to take into consideration even belated remorse.” Heine, in *Sozialistische Monatshefte* describes Vandervelde’s behaviour as “courageous and proud,” and sets him up as an example for the German Lefts.

In short, when the war ends, appoint a commission consisting of Kautsky and Plekhanov, Vandervelde and Adler and a “unanimous” resolution in the spirit of mutual amnesty will be drawn up in a trice. The dispute will be safely covered up. Instead of helping the workers to understand what has occurred, they will deceive them with sham, paper “unity.” The amalgamation of the social-chauvinists and hypocrites of all countries will be described as the restoration of the International.

We must not conceal from ourselves the fact that the danger of such a “restoration” is very great. The social-chauvinists of all countries are equally interested in it. All of them are equally unwilling that the masses of the workers

themselves should try to grasp the issue: Socialism or nationalism? All of them are equally interested in covering up each other's sins. None of them is able to propose anything except what is proposed by that virtuoso in "international" hypocrisy, Kautsky.

And yet, this danger is scarcely realized. During the year of war we have witnessed a number of attempts to restore international connections. We will not speak of the conferences in London and Vienna, at which downright chauvinists assembled to help the General Staffs and the bourgeoisie of their "fatherlands." We have in mind the conferences in Lugano¹⁴ and Copenhagen,¹⁵ the International Women's Conference,¹⁶ and the International Youth Conference.¹⁷ These assemblies were inspired by the best wishes. But they totally failed to see the above-mentioned danger. They did not lay down a fighting line for internationalists. They did not point out to the proletariat the danger that threatens it from the social-chauvinists' method of "restoring" the International. At best, they confined themselves to repeating the old resolutions without indicating to the workers that unless a struggle is waged against the social-chauvinists, the cause of Socialism is hopeless. At best they *marked time*.

THE STATE OF AFFAIRS AMONG THE OPPOSITION

There can be no doubt whatever that what interests all internationalists most is the state of affairs among the German Social-Democratic opposition. Official German Social-Democracy, which was the strongest and the leading party in the Second International, struck the heaviest blow at the

international workers' organization. But at the same time, it was in German Social-Democracy that the strongest opposition was found. Of all the big European parties, it was in the German party that the loud voice of protest of the comrades who have remained loyal to the banner of Socialism was first raised. It was with joy that we read the magazines *Lichtstrahlen* and *Die Internationale*. With still greater joy we learned of the distribution in Germany of secretly printed manifestoes, as for example the manifesto entitled: "The Chief Enemy Is at Home." This showed that the spirit of Socialism is alive among the German workers, that there are still people in Germany capable of upholding revolutionary Marxism.

The split in the present-day socialist movement has been most strikingly revealed within German Social-Democracy. Here we very distinctly see three trends: the opportunist-chauvinists, who have nowhere sunk to such a degree of renegacy as they have in Germany; the Kautskyan "Centre," which has here proved to be incapable of playing any other role than that of servitors of the opportunists; and the Left — who are the only Social-Democrats in Germany.

Naturally, what interests us most of all is the state of affairs among the German Left. In it we see our comrades, the hope of all the internationalist elements.

What is the state of affairs in it?

The magazine *Die Internationale* was quite right when it wrote that the German Left was still in a state of ferment, that considerable regroupings still lie ahead in it, that there are more resolute and less resolute elements within it.

We Russian internationalists do not in the least, of course, claim the right to interfere in the internal affairs of our comrades the German Lefts. We are aware that they alone are

fully competent to determine their methods of fighting the opportunists in conformity with the conditions of time and place. Only, we deem it our right and duty frankly to express our opinion on the state of affairs.

We are convinced that the author of the leading article in the magazine *Die Internationale* was profoundly right when he asserted that the Kautskyan "Centre" is doing more harm to Marxism than avowed social-chauvinism. Whoever now obscures disagreements, whoever now, in the guise of Marxism, preaches to the workers what Kautskyism is preaching, is lulling the workers, is more harmful than the Südekums and Heines, who put the question bluntly and compel the workers to try to grasp the issue.

The fact that Kautsky and Haase are permitting themselves lately to demur against the "official bodies" should mislead nobody. The disagreements between them and the Scheidemanns are not on fundamentals. The former believe that Hindenburg and Mackensen are *already* victorious and that they can already permit themselves the luxury of protesting against annexations. The latter believe that Hindenburg and Mackensen are not *yet* victorious and that, therefore, it is necessary "to hold out to the end."

Kautskyism is waging only a sham fight against the "official bodies" precisely in order to be able, after the war, to obscure the fundamental dispute for the workers and to gloss the matter over with the 1,001st puffy resolution couched in a vaguely "Leftist" spirit, in the drafting of which the diplomats of the Second International are such masters.

It is quite understandable that in their arduous struggle against the "official bodies" the German opposition should also make use of this unprincipled opposition raised by Kautskyism. But what must remain the touchstone for every interna-

tionalist is — hostility towards neo-Kautskyism. Only he is a genuine internationalist who fights Kautskyism, who understands that, fundamentally, the "Centre," *even after* the sham turn taken by its leaders, remains an *ally of the chauvinists and opportunists*.

Of enormous importance is our attitude towards the wavering elements in the International in general. These elements — mainly Socialists of the *pacifist* shade — are to be found both in the neutral countries and in some of the belligerent countries (in England, for example, the Independent Labour Party).¹⁸ These elements can be our fellow travellers. Rapprochement with them in opposition to the social-chauvinists is necessary. But it must be borne in mind that they are *only* fellow travellers, that on the chief and fundamental issues, with the restoration of the International, these elements will go not with us, but against us, they will go with Kautsky, Scheidemann, Vandervelde and Sembat. At international conferences we must not limit our programme to what is acceptable to these elements. If we do, we will become the captives of the wavering pacifists. This is what happened, for example, at the International Women's Conference in Berne. The German delegation, which supported Comrade Clara Zetkin's point of view, actually played the part of the "Centre" at this conference. The Women's Conference said only what was acceptable to the delegates from the opportunist Dutch party led by Troelstra, and to the delegates of the Independent Labour Party, which — we will not forget this — at the London conference of "Entente" chauvinists voted for Vandervelde's resolution. We express our greatest respect for the I.L.P. for the brave struggle it has been waging against the British government during the war. But we know that this party

has not adopted the Marxist stand. We, however, are of the opinion that the chief task of the Social-Democratic opposition at the present moment is to raise the banner of revolutionary Marxism, to tell the workers firmly and definitely how we regard imperialist wars, to issue the watchword of mass revolutionary action, i.e., transform the epoch of imperialist wars into the beginning of the epoch of civil wars.

In spite of everything, there are revolutionary Social-Democratic elements in many countries. They are to be found in Germany, and in Russia, and in Scandinavia (the influential trend of which Comrade Høglund is the representative), and in the Balkans (the party of the Bulgarian "Tesnyaki"),¹⁹ and in Italy, and in England (a section of the British Socialist Party),²⁰ and in France (Vaillant himself has admitted in *L'Humanité* that he has received letters of protest from internationalists, but he has not published one of them in full), and in Holland (the *Tribunists*),²¹ etc. To rally these Marxist elements — however small their numbers may be at the beginning — to recall in their name the now forgotten words of genuine Socialism, to call upon the workers of all countries to break with the chauvinists and to come under the old banner of Marxism — such is the task of the day.

Conferences with so-called programmes of 'action' have amounted up till now only to the proclamation, more or less fully, of the programme of simple pacifism. Marxism is not pacifism. It is necessary, of course, to fight for the speediest termination of the war. But only if a *revolutionary* struggle is called for does the demand for "peace" acquire proletarian meaning. Without a series of revolutions, so-called democratic peace is a philistine utopia. The purpose of a real programme of action would be served only by a *Marxian* programme, which gave the masses a full and clear explanation

of what has occurred, which explained what imperialism is and how to combat it, which openly stated that it was opportunism that led to the collapse of the Second International, which openly called for the building of a Marxist International without and *against* the opportunists. Only such a programme as would show that we have confidence in ourselves, confidence in Marxism, that we proclaim a life-and-death struggle against opportunism would sooner or later ensure for us the sympathy of the genuine proletarian masses.

THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY AND THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party split away from its opportunists long ago. The Russian opportunists have now, in addition, become chauvinists. This only strengthens our opinion that a split from them in the interests of Socialism is essential. We are convinced that the Social-Democrats' present disagreements with the social-chauvinists are in no way less wide than the Socialists' disagreements with the Anarchists when the Social-Democrats split away from the latter. The opportunist Monitor rightly said in *Preussische Jahrbücher* that the present unity was to the advantage of the opportunists and the bourgeoisie because it compelled the Lefts to submit to the chauvinists and prevents the workers from grasping the issue and from forming their own genuinely workers', genuinely socialist party. We are most firmly convinced that in the present state of affairs, a split from the opportunists and chauvinists is the primary duty of the revolutionary — just as a split from the yellows, the anti-Semites, the liberal workers' unions, etc., was essen-

tial precisely in the interests of the speediest enlightenment of the backward workers and of drawing them into the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party.

In our opinion, the Third International should be built on precisely such a revolutionary basis. For our Party, the question as to whether it is expedient to break with the social-chauvinists does not exist. For it, this question has been irrevocably settled. The only question that exists for our Party is whether this can be achieved in the nearest future on an international scale.

It is quite understandable that to bring about an *international* Marxist organization, there must be a readiness to form independent Marxist parties in *different* countries. Germany, being the country with the oldest and strongest working-class movement, is of decisive importance. The immediate future will show whether conditions have already ripened for the formation of a new, Marxist International. If they have, our Party will gladly join such a Third International that will be purged of opportunism and chauvinism. If they have not, it will show that a more or less prolonged evolution is needed for this purging. In that case, our Party will be the extreme opposition within the old International — until a base is formed in different countries for an international working men's association that stands on the basis of revolutionary Marxism.

We do not, nor can we, know, what developments will take place in the international arena within the next few years. But there is one thing we know for certain, and of which we are unshakably convinced, namely, that *our* Party, in *our* country, among *our* proletariat, will work tirelessly in the above-mentioned direction, and by all its daily activities

will build up the Russian section of the *Marxist International*.

In Russia too we have no lack of avowed social-chauvinists and "Centre" groups. These people will fight against the formation of a Marxist International. We know that Plekhanov, in principle, stands on the same ground as Südekum and is already stretching out a hand to him. We know that the so-called "Organization Committee" led by Axelrod is preaching Kautskyism on Russian soil. In the guise of working-class unity, these people are preaching unity with the opportunists and, through them, with the bourgeoisie. But everything we know about the present working-class movement in Russia fully convinces us that the class-conscious proletariat in Russia will, as hitherto, remain with *our Party*.

CHAPTER IV
**THE HISTORY OF THE SPLIT
AND THE PRESENT STATE
OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA**

The above-described tactics of the R.S.D.L.P. in relation to the war are the inevitable result of the thirty years' development of Social-Democracy in Russia. These tactics, and the present state of Social-Democracy in our country, cannot be properly understood unless one ponders over the history of our Party. That is why we must here too remind the reader about the major facts in this history.

As an ideological trend, Social-Democracy arose in 1883, when Social-Democratic views as applied to Russia were for the first time systematically expounded abroad by the Emancipation of Labour Group. Until the beginning of the nineties, Social-Democracy remained an ideological trend with no connection with the mass working-class movement in Russia. At the beginning of the nineties, the upswing of the social movement, the unrest and strike movement among the workers, transformed Social-Democracy into an active political force inseparably connected with the struggle (both economic and political) of the working class. And from that very moment Social-Democracy began to split up into "Economists" and "*Iskra*-ists."

THE "ECONOMISTS" AND THE OLD *ISKRA*²² (1894-1903)

"Economism" was an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy. Its political essence was summed up in the programme: "for the workers — the economic struggle; for the liberals — the political struggle." Its chief theoretical prop was so-called "legal Marxism" or "Struveism," which "recognized" a "Marxism" that was completely purged of every scrap of revolutionary spirit and was adapted to the requirements of the liberal bourgeoisie. On the plea that the masses of the workers in Russia were immature, and wishing to "march with the masses," the "Economists" restricted the tasks and scope of the working-class movement to the economic struggle and political support for liberalism, and did not set themselves independent political or any revolutionary tasks.

The old *Iskra* (1900-1903) waged a victorious struggle against "Economism" for the principles of revolutionary Social-Democracy. The entire flower of the class-conscious proletariat took the side of *Iskra*. For a number of years before the revolution Social-Democracy advocated the most consistent and uncompromising programme. Both the class struggle and the action of the masses during the 1905 revolution confirmed the correctness of this programme. The "Economists" adapted themselves to the backwardness of the masses. *Iskra* trained the vanguard of the workers that was capable of leading the masses forward. The arguments at present advanced by the social-chauvinists (that it is necessary to reckon with the masses, that imperialism is pro-

gressive, about the "illusions" harboured by revolutionaries, etc.), had *all* been advanced by the Economists. The opportunist alteration of Marxism to the "Struveist" style became known to Social-Democracy in Russia twenty years ago.

MENSHEVISM AND BOLSHEVISM (1903-1908)

The epoch of bourgeois-democratic revolution gave rise to a new struggle between trends in Social-Democracy that was the direct continuation of the preceding struggle. "Economism" changed into 'Menshevism'. The championing of the revolutionary tactics of the old *Iskra* gave rise to "Bolshevism".

In the turbulent years of 1905-1907, Menshevism was an opportunist trend backed by the bourgeois liberals, and carried liberal-bourgeois trends into the working-class movement. Adaptation of the working-class struggle to liberalism — such was its substance. Bolshevism, on the contrary, set the Social-Democratic workers the task of rousing the democratic peasantry for the revolutionary struggle despite the vacillation and treachery of liberalism. And the masses of the workers, as the Mensheviks themselves admitted more than once, marched with the Bolsheviks during the revolution in all the biggest actions.

The 1905 revolution tested, strengthened, deepened and steeled the uncompromisingly revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics in Russia. The open actions of classes and parties repeatedly disclosed the connection between Social-Democratic opportunism ("Menshevism") and liberalism.

MARXISM AND LIQUIDATIONISM (1908-1914)

The counter-revolutionary epoch again, in an entirely new form, placed the question of the opportunist and revolutionary tactics of Social-Democracy on the order of the day. The chief current of Menshevism, in spite of the protests of many of its best representatives, gave rise to the trend of liquidationism, renunciation of the struggle for a new revolution in Russia, renunciation of secret organization and activity, contempt for and ridicule of the "underground," of the slogan of a republic, etc. The group of legal writers for the magazine *Nasba Zarya* (Messrs. Potressov, Cherevanin, and others) constituted a nucleus, independent of the old Social-Democratic Party, which in a thousand ways was supported, boosted and nursed by the liberal bourgeoisie of Russia which wanted to wean the workers from the revolutionary struggle.

This group of opportunists was expelled from the Party by the January Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., 1912,²² which restored the Party in spite of the furious resistance of a number of groups and coteries abroad. For more than two years (beginning of 1912 to the middle of 1914) a stubborn struggle raged between the two Social-Democratic parties: the Central Committee that was elected in January 1912 and the "Organization Committee" which refused to recognize the January Conference and wanted to restore the Party in a different way, by maintaining unity with the *Nasba Zarya* group. A stubborn struggle raged between the two daily workers' newspapers (*Pravda* and *Luch*²⁴ and their successors), and between the two Social-Democratic groups in the Fourth State Duma (the R.S.D.L. group of Pravdists, or

Marxists, and the "Social-Democratic group" of the Liquidators headed by Chkhaidze).

Championing loyalty to the Party's revolutionary principles, fostering the incipient revival of the working-class movement (especially after the spring of 1912), combining underground with open organization, press and agitation, the Pravdists rallied around themselves the overwhelming majority of the class-conscious working class, whereas the Liquidators — who as a political force operated exclusively through the *Nasba Zarya* group — leaned on the all-round support of the liberal-bourgeois elements.

The open financial contributions of workers' groups to the newspapers of the two parties, which was at that time a form of Social-Democratic *membership dues* adapted to Russian conditions (and the only one legally possible and freely verifiable by all), strikingly confirmed the proletarian source of the strength and influence of the Pravdists (Marxists) and the bourgeois-liberal source of that of the Liquidators (and their "O.C."). Here are brief figures of these contributions, which are given in full in the book *Marxism and Liquidationism*²⁵ and in an abbreviated form in the German Social-Democratic newspaper *The Leipzig People's Paper*²⁶ of July 21, 1914.

Number and amounts of contributions to the daily St. Petersburg newspapers, Marxist (Pravdist) and Liquidationist, from January 1 to May 13, 1914:

	Pravdist		Liquidationist	
	Number of contributions	Amount in rbls.	Number of contributions	Amount in rbls.
From workers' groups	2,873	18,934	671	3,296
From non-workers' groups	713	2,650	453	6,760

Thus, by 1914, our Party had united four-fifths of the class-conscious workers of Russia around revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics. For the whole of 1913 the Pravdists received contributions from 2,181 workers' groups and the Liquidators from 661. The figures from January 1, 1913 to May 13, 1914 will be: 3,054 contributions from workers' groups for the Pravdists (that is, for our Party), and 1,332, i.e., 20.8 per cent, for the Liquidators.

MARXISM AND SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM (1914-1915)

The great European war of 1914-1915 gave all the European and also the Russian Social-Democrats the opportunity to test their tactics on a crisis of world-wide dimensions. The reactionary, predatory and slave-owner character of the war stands out in immeasurably more striking relief in the case of tsarism than it does in the case of the other governments. Nevertheless, the major group of Liquidators (the only group besides ours which has serious influence in Russia thanks to its liberal connections) turned towards social-chauvinism! Enjoying a monopoly of legality for a fairly long period, this *Nasba Zarya* group conducted propaganda among the masses in favour of "non-resistance to the war," of wishing for the victory of the triple (now quadruple) entente, accusing German imperialism of "super-diabolical sins," etc. Plekhanov, who, since 1903, has repeatedly given examples of his extreme political spinelessness and desertion to opportunism, took up still more pronouncedly the very position that is so highly praised by the whole of the bour-

geois press of Russia. Plekhanov has sunk so low as to declare that tsarism is waging a just war, and to publish an interview in the government newspapers in Italy urging her to enter the war!!

The correctness of our appraisal of liquidationism and of the expulsion of the major group of Liquidators from our Party is thus fully confirmed. The real programme of the Liquidators and the real significance of their trend now constitute not only opportunism in general, but defence of the imperialist privileges and advantages of the Great-Russian landlords and bourgeoisie. It is a *national-liberal* labour policy trend. It is an alliance of a section of the radical petty bourgeoisie and a tiny handful of privileged workers with "their" national bourgeoisie against the mass of the proletariat.

THE PRESENT STATE OF AFFAIRS IN RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

As we have already said, neither the Liquidators, nor a number of groups abroad (those of Plekhanov, Alexinsky, Trotsky and others), nor the so-called "national" (i.e., non-Great Russian) Social-Democrats have recognized our Conference of January 1912. Among the innumerable epithets hurled against us, those most often repeated were "usurpers" and "splitters." We answered by quoting exact and objectively verifiable figures showing that our Party united four-fifths of the class-conscious workers in Russia. This is no small figure considering the difficulties of underground activities in a counter-revolutionary epoch.

If "unity" were possible in Russia on the basis of Social-Democratic tactics without expelling the *Nasba Zarya* group, why have not our numerous opponents brought it about *even among themselves*? No less than three and a half years have passed since January 1912, and during the whole of this time our opponents, much as they have desired to do so, have failed to form a Social-Democratic party in opposition to us. This fact is our Party's best defence.

The entire history of the Social-Democratic groups that are fighting our Party is a history of collapse and disintegration. In March 1912, all of them without exception "united" in abusing us. But already in August 1912, when the so-called "August bloc" was formed against us, disintegration began among them. Some of the groups fell away from them. They could not form a party and a Central Committee. They set up only an Organization Committee "for the purpose of restoring unity." Actually, this O.C. turned out to be a feeble cover for the liquidationist group in Russia. During the whole period of the tremendous upswing of the working-class movement in Russia and of the mass strikes of 1912-1914, the only group in the entire August bloc that conducted activities among the masses was the *Nasba Zarya* group, whose strength lay in its liberal connections. And in the beginning of 1914, the Lettish Social-Democrats officially withdrew from the "August bloc" (the Polish Social-Democrats did not join it), while Trotsky, one of the leaders of the bloc, left it unofficially, having again formed his own separate group. In July 1914, at the conference in Brussels, with the participation of the Executive Committee of the I.S.B., Kautsky and Vandervelde, the so-called "Brussels bloc" was formed against us, which the Letts did not join, and from which the Polish opposition Social-Democrats

forthwith withdrew. When the war broke out this bloc collapsed. *Nasba Zarya*, Plekhanov, Alexinsky and An,²⁷ the leader of the Caucasian Social-Democrats, became open social-chauvinists, preaching the desirability of Germany's defeat. The O.C. and the Bund defended the social-chauvinists and the principles of social-chauvinism. The Chkheidze Duma group, although it voted against the war credits (in Russia, even the bourgeois democrats, the Trudoviki, voted against them), remained *Nasba Zarya's* faithful ally. Our extreme social-chauvinists, Plekhanov, Alexinsky and Co., were quite pleased with the Chkheidze group. In Paris, the newspaper *Nasbe Slovo* (formerly *Golos*) was started, with the participation mainly of Martov and Trotsky, who wanted to combine platonic defence of internationalism with the absolute demand for unity with *Nasba Zarya*, the O.C. or the Chkheidze group. After 250 issues of this newspaper, it was itself forced to admit its disintegration: one section of the editorial board gravitated towards our Party, Martov remained faithful to the O.C. which publicly censured *Nasbe Slovo* for its "anarchism" (just as the opportunists in Germany, David and Co., *Internationale Korrespondenz*,²⁸ Legien and Co. charge Comrade Liebknecht with anarchism); Trotsky announced his rupture with the O.C., but wanted to go with the Chkheidze group. Here are the programme and tactics of the Chkheidze group, enunciated by one of its leaders. In No. 5, 1915, of *Sovremenny Mir*,²⁹ magazine of the Plekhanov and Alexinsky trend, Chkhenkeli writes: "To say that German Social-Democracy was in a position to prevent its country from going to war but failed to do so would mean either secretly wishing that it should not only have breathed its last breath on the barricades but also have

*bad its fatherland breathe its last, or looking at nearby things through an anarchist telescope.”**

These few lines express the sum and substance of social-chauvinism: both the justification on principle of the “defence of the fatherland” idea and mockery—with the permission of the military censors—at the preaching and preparation of revolution. It is not at all a question as to whether German Social-Democracy was or was not in a position to prevent war, nor whether, in general, revolutionaries can guarantee the success of a revolution. The question is: should we behave like Socialists or really “breathe our last” in the embrace of the imperialist bourgeoisie?

OUR PARTY'S TASKS

Social-Democracy in Russia arose before the bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905) in our country and gained strength during the revolution and counter-revolution. The backwardness of Russia explained the extraordinary multiplicity of trends and shades of petty-bourgeois opportunism in our country; and the influence of Marxism in Europe and the stability of the legally existing Social-Democratic parties before the war converted our exemplary liberals into near-admirers of the “reasonable,” “European” (non-revolutionary), “legal” “Marxist” theory and Social-Democracy. The

* “S.M.” No. 5, 1915, p. 148. Trotsky announced recently that he deemed it his task to raise the prestige of the Chkheidze group in the International. No doubt Chkhenkeli will with equal energy raise Trotsky's prestige in the International. . . .

working class of Russia could not build up its party otherwise than in a resolute, thirty-year struggle against all the varieties of opportunism. The experience of the world war, which has brought about the shameful collapse of European opportunism and has strengthened the alliance of our national-liberals with social-chauvinist liquidationism, still further strengthens our conviction that our Party must continue further along the same consistently revolutionary road.

Written in July-August 1913

Published in pamphlet form
in the autumn of 1913 by the
editorial board of the newspaper
Sotsial-Demokrat, Geneva

THE WAR PROGRAMME OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION³⁰

In Holland, Scandinavia and Switzerland, voices are heard among the revolutionary Social-Democrats who are combating the social-chauvinist lies about "defence of the fatherland" in the present imperialist war, in favour of substituting for the old point in the Social-Democratic minimum programme: "militia," or "the armed nation," a new one: "disarmament." The *Jugend-Internationale* has inaugurated a discussion on this question and has published in No. 3 an editorial article in favour of disarmament. In R. Grimm's latest theses,³¹ we regret to note, there is also a concession to the "disarmament" idea. Discussions have been started in the periodicals *Neues Leben*³² and *Vorbote*.

Let us examine the position of the advocates of disarmament.

I

The main argument is that the demand for disarmament is the clearest, most decisive, most consistent expression of the struggle against all militarism and against all war.

But this main argument is precisely the principal error of the advocates of disarmament. Socialists cannot, without ceasing to be Socialists, be opposed to all war.

In the first place, Socialists have never been, nor can they ever be, opposed to revolutionary wars. The bourgeoisie of the "Great" imperialist Powers has become thoroughly reactionary, and we regard the war which *this* bourgeoisie is now waging as a reactionary, slave-owners' and criminal war. But what about a war *against* this bourgeoisie? For example, a war waged by people who are oppressed by and dependent upon this bourgeoisie, by colonial peoples, for their liberation? In the theses of the *Internationale* group, in §5, we read: "In the era of this unbridled imperialism there can be no more national wars of any kind." This is obviously wrong.

The history of the twentieth century, this century of "unbridled imperialism," is replete with colonial wars. But what we Europeans, the imperialist oppressors of the majority of the peoples of the world, with our habitual, despicable European chauvinism, call "colonial wars" are often national wars, or national rebellions of those oppressed peoples. One of the main features of imperialism is that it accelerates the development of capitalism in the most backward countries, and thereby widens and intensifies the struggle against national oppression. This is a fact. It inevitably follows from this that imperialism must often give rise to national wars. *Junius*,³³ who in her pamphlet defends the above-quoted "theses," says that in the imperialist epoch every national war against one of the imperialist Great Powers leads to the intervention of another competing imperialist Great Power and thus, every national war is converted into an imperialist war. But this argument is also wrong. This

may happen, but it does not always happen. Many colonial wars in the period between 1900 and 1914 did not follow this road. And it would be simply ridiculous if we declared, for instance, that after the present war, if it ends in the extreme exhaustion of all the belligerents, "there can be no" national, progressive, revolutionary wars "whatever," waged, say, by China in alliance with India, Persia, Siam, etc., against the Great Powers.

To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong in theory, obviously mistaken historically, and in practice is tantamount to European chauvinism: we who belong to nations that oppress hundreds of millions of people in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., must tell the oppressed peoples that it is "impossible" for them to wage war against "our" nations!

Secondly, civil wars are also wars. Whoever recognizes the class struggle cannot fail to recognize civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain conditions, inevitable continuation, development and intensification of the class struggle. All the great revolutions prove this. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, would mean sinking into extreme opportunism and renouncing the socialist revolution.

Thirdly, the victory of Socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all war in general. On the contrary, it presupposes such wars. The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in the various countries. It cannot be otherwise under the commodity production system. From this it follows irrefutably that Socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously *in all* countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or prebourgeois for some time. This must not only

create friction, but a direct striving on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletariat of the socialist state. In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for Socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie. Engels was perfectly right when, in his letter to Kautsky, September 12, 1882,³⁴ he openly admitted that it was possible for *already victorious* Socialism to wage "defensive wars." What he had in mind was defence of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished, and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not only of one country, will wars become impossible. And from a scientific point of view it would be utterly wrong and utterly unrevolutionary for us to evade or gloss over the most important thing, namely, that the most difficult task, the one demanding the greatest amount of fighting in the *transition* to Socialism, is to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie. "Social" parsons and opportunists are always ready to dream about the future peaceful Socialism; but the very thing that distinguishes them from revolutionary Social-Democrats is that they refuse to think about and reflect on the fierce class struggle and class *wars* that are necessary for the achievement of this beautiful future.

We must not allow ourselves to be led astray by words. The term "defence of the fatherland," for instance, is hateful to many, because the avowed opportunists and the Kautskyites use it to cover up and gloss over the lies of the bourgeoisie in the *present* predatory war. This is a fact. It does not follow from this, however, that we must forget to ponder over the meaning of political slogans. Recognizing "defence of the fatherland" in the present war is nothing more nor

less than recognizing it as a "just" war, a war in the interests of the proletariat — nothing more nor less, we repeat, because invasions may occur in any war. It would be simply foolish to repudiate "defence of the fatherland" *on the part of* the oppressed nations in their wars *against* the imperialist Great Powers, or on the part of a victorious proletariat in *its* war against some Galliffet³⁶ of a bourgeois state.

Theoretically, it would be quite wrong to forget that every war is but the continuation of politics by other means; the present imperialist war is the continuation of the imperialist politics of two groups of Great Powers, and these politics were engendered and fostered by the sum total of the relationships of the imperialist epoch. But this very epoch must also necessarily engender and foster the politics of struggle against national oppression and of the proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie, and therefore, also the possibility and the inevitability, first, of revolutionary national rebellions and wars; second, of proletarian wars and rebellions *against* the bourgeoisie; and, third, of a combination of both kinds of revolutionary war, etc.

II

To this must be added the following general considerations.

An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to use arms, to acquire arms, only deserves to be treated like slaves. We cannot forget, unless we become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, that we are living in a class society, that there is no way out of this society, and there can be none, except by means of the class struggle. In every class society, whether

it is based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at present, on wage labour, the oppressing class is armed. Not only the modern standing army, but even the modern militia—even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, Switzerland, for example—represent the bourgeoisie armed *against* the proletariat. This is such an elementary truth that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon it. It is sufficient to recall the use of troops against strikers in all capitalist countries.

The fact that the bourgeoisie is armed against the proletariat is one of the biggest, most fundamental, and most important facts in modern capitalist society. And in face of this fact, revolutionary Social-Democrats are urged to “demand” “disarmament”! This is tantamount to the complete abandonment of the point of view of the class struggle, the renunciation of all thought of revolution. Our slogan must be: the arming of the proletariat for the purpose of vanquishing, expropriating and disarming the bourgeoisie. These are the only tactics a revolutionary class can adopt, tactics which follow logically from the whole *objective development* of capitalist militarism, and dictated by that development. Only *after* the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world-historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap; and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but *only when this condition has been fulfilled, certainly not before.*

If the present war rouses among the reactionary Christian Socialists, among the whimpering petty bourgeoisie, *only* horror and fright, *only* aversion to all use of arms, to bloodshed, death, etc., then we must say: capitalist society is always an *endless horror*. And if this most reactionary of all wars is now preparing a *horrible end* for that society, we have no reason to drop into despair. At a time when, as

everyone can see, the bourgeoisie itself is paving the way for the only legitimate and revolutionary war, namely, civil war against the imperialist bourgeoisie, the "demand" for disarmament, or more correctly, the dream of disarmament, is, objectively, nothing but an expression of despair.

Those who will say that this is a theory divorced from life, we will remind of two world-historical facts: the role of trusts and the employment of women in industry, on the one hand; and the Paris Commune of 1871 and the December uprising of 1905 in Russia, on the other.

The business of the bourgeoisie is to promote trusts, to drive women and children into the factories, to torture them there, to corrupt them, to condemn them to extreme poverty. We do not "demand" such a development. We do not "support" it; we fight it. But *how* do we fight? We know that trusts and the employment of women in industry are progressive. We do not want to go back to the handicraft system, to premonopolistic capitalism, to domestic drudgery for women. Forward through the trusts, etc., and beyond them to Socialism!

This argument is, with the necessary changes, applicable also to the present militarization of the people. Today the imperialist bourgeoisie militarizes not only the adults, but also the youth. Tomorrow, it may proceed to militarize the women. To this we must say: All the better! Go ahead faster! The faster it goes, the nearer shall we be to the armed uprising against capitalism. How can Social-Democrats allow themselves to be frightened by the militarization of the youth, etc., if they have not forgotten the example of the Paris Commune? This is not a "theory divorced from life," it is not a dream, but a fact. It would be very bad indeed if, notwithstanding all the economic and political

facts, Social-Democrats began to doubt that the imperialist epoch and imperialist wars must inevitably bring about a repetition of such facts

A certain bourgeois observer of the Paris Commune, writing to an English newspaper in May 1871, said 'If the French nation consisted entirely of women, what a terrible nation it would be!' Women, and children of thirteen and upwards, fought in the Paris Commune side by side with the men. Nor can it be different in the forthcoming battles for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. The proletarian women will not look on passively while the well-armed bourgeoisie shoot down the poorly-armed or unarmed workers. They will take to arms as they did in 1871, and from the cowed nations of today — or more correctly, from the present-day working-class movement, which is disorganized more by the opportunists than by the governments — there will undoubtedly arise, sooner or later, but with absolute certainty, an international league of the "terrible nations" of the revolutionary proletariat

Militarism is now permeating the whole of social life. Imperialism is a fierce struggle of the Great Powers for the division and redivision of the world — therefore, it must inevitably lead to further militarization in all countries, even in the neutral and small countries. What will the proletarian women do against it? Only curse all war and everything military, only demand disarmament? The women of an oppressed class that is really revolutionary will never consent to play such a shameful role. They will say to their sons: 'You will soon be a man. You will be given a gun. Take it and learn the military art. The proletarians need this knowledge not to shoot your brothers, the workers of other countries, as they are doing in the present war, and as you

are being told to do by the traitors to Socialism, but to fight the bourgeoisie of your own country, to put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, not by means of good intentions, but by vanquishing the bourgeoisie and by disarming it."

If we are to refrain from conducting such propaganda, precisely such propaganda, in connection with the present war, then we had better stop using highfalutin phrases about international revolutionary Social-Democracy, about the socialist revolution, and about war against war.

III

The advocates of disarmament oppose the point in the programme about the "armed nation" for the reason, among others, that this demand, they allege, easily leads to concessions to opportunism. We have examined above the most important point, namely, the relation of disarmament to the class struggle and to the social revolution. We will now examine the relation between the demand for disarmament and opportunism. One of the most important reasons why this demand is unacceptable is precisely that it, and the illusions it creates, inevitably weaken and devitalize our struggle against opportunism.

Undoubtedly this struggle is the main question immediately confronting the International. A struggle against imperialism that is not closely linked up with the struggle against opportunism is an idle phrase, or a fraud. One of the main defects of Zimmerwald and Kienthal,³⁶ one of the main reasons why these embryos of the Third International may possibly end in a fiasco, is that the question of the struggle against opportunism was not even raised

openly, much less decided in the sense of proclaiming the necessity of a rupture with the opportunists. Opportunism has triumphed—temporarily—in the European working-class movement. Two main shades of opportunism have arisen in all the big countries: first, the avowed, cynical, and therefore less dangerous social-imperialism of Messrs. Plekhanov, Scheidemann, Legien, Albert Thomas and Sembat, Vandervelde, Hyndman, Henderson, *et al*; second, the concealed, Kautskyite opportunism: Kautsky-Haase and the Social-Democratic Labour Group in Germany;³⁷ Longuet, Pressmane, Mayeras, *et al*, in France; Ramsay MacDonald and the other leaders of the Independent Labour Party in England; Martov, Chkheidze and others in Russia; Treves and the other so-called Left reformists in Italy.

Avowed opportunism is openly and directly opposed to revolution and to the incipient revolutionary movements and outbursts, and is in direct alliance with the governments, varied as the forms of this alliance may be: from participation in Cabinets to participation in the War Industries Committees (in Russia).³⁸ The masked opportunists, the Kautskyites, are much more harmful and dangerous to the working-class movement, because they hide their advocacy of an alliance with the former under a cloak of plausible, pseudo-“Marxist” catchwords and pacifist slogans. The fight against both these forms of prevailing opportunism must be conducted in *all* fields of proletarian politics: parliament, trade unions, strikes, military affairs, etc. The main distinguishing feature of *both* these forms of prevailing opportunism is that the concrete question of the *connection between the present war and revolution and other concrete questions of revolution* is hushed up, concealed, or treated with an eye to police prohibitions. And this is done, notwithstanding

the fact that before the war the connection between precisely *this* war that was impending and the proletarian revolution was pointed to innumerable times, both unofficially, and in the Basle Manifesto officially. The main defect in the demand for disarmament is its evasion of all the concrete questions of revolution. Or do the advocates of disarmament stand for a perfectly new species of unarmed revolution?

To proceed. We are by no means opposed to the fight for reforms. We do not wish to ignore the sad possibility that humanity may — if the worst comes to the worst — go through a second imperialist war, if, in spite of the numerous outbursts of mass unrest and mass discontent, and in spite of our efforts, revolution does not come out of the present war. We are in favour of a programme of reforms which is *also* directed against the opportunists. The opportunists would be only too glad if we left the struggle for reforms entirely to them, and, saving ourselves by flight from sad reality, sought shelter in the heights above the clouds in some sort of “disarmament.” “Disarmament” means simply running away from unpleasant reality and not fighting against it.

In such a programme we would say something like this: “The slogan and the recognition of defence of the fatherland in the imperialist war of 1914-16 is only a means of corrupting the working-class movement with the aid of a bourgeois lie.” Such a concrete reply to concrete questions would be theoretically more correct, much more useful to the proletariat and more unbearable to the opportunists, than the demand for disarmament and the repudiation of all “defence of the fatherland.” And we might add: “The bourgeoisie of all the imperialist Great Powers — England, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, Italy, Japan, the United States — has become so reactionary and so imbued with the

striving for world domination, that *any* war conducted by *the bourgeoisie of those countries* can be nothing but reactionary. The proletariat must not only oppose all such wars, but it must also wish for the defeat of its 'own' government in such wars and utilize it for revolutionary insurrection, if an insurrection to prevent the war proves unsuccessful."

On the question of a militia, we should have said: We are not in favour of a bourgeois militia; we are in favour only of a proletarian militia. Therefore, "not a penny, not a man," not only for a standing army, but even for a bourgeois militia, even in countries like the United States, or Switzerland, Norway, etc.; the more so that in the freest republican countries (e.g., Switzerland), we see that the militia is being more and more Prussianized, particularly in 1907 and 1911, and prostituted by being mobilized against strikers. We can demand election of officers by the people, abolition of all military law, equal rights for foreign and native-born workers (a point particularly important for those imperialist states which, like Switzerland, more and more blatantly exploit increasing numbers of foreign workers while refusing to grant them rights); further, the right of every hundred, say, of the inhabitants of the given country to form voluntary military training associations, with free election of instructors, who are to be paid by the state, etc. Only under such conditions could the proletariat acquire military training really for *itself* and not for its slave-owners; and the need for such training is imperatively dictated by the interests of the proletariat. The Russian revolution showed that every success of the revolutionary movement, even a partial success like the seizure of a certain city, a certain factory village, a certain section of the army — inevitably

compels the victorious proletariat to carry out just such a programme.

Finally, it goes without saying that opportunism cannot be fought merely by means of programmes; it can be fought only by constant vigilance to see that they are really carried out. The greatest, the fatal error the bankrupt Second International committed was that its words did not correspond to its deeds, that it acquired the habit of hypocrisy and shameless revolutionary phrase-mongering (note the present attitude of Kautsky and Co. towards the Basle Manifesto). Disarmament as a social idea, i.e., an idea that springs from a certain social environment and can affect a certain social environment — and is not merely a cranky notion of an individual — has evidently sprung from the exceptionally “tranquil” conditions of life prevailing in certain small states which for a rather long time have stood aside from the bloody world highway of war and hope to stay aside. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient, for instance, to ponder over the arguments advanced by the Norwegian advocates of disarmament. “We are a small country,” they say. “We have a small army, we can do nothing against the Great Powers” (and are, therefore, also powerless to resist being forcibly drawn into an imperialist *alliance* with one or the other group of Great Powers) . . . “We want to be left in peace in our remote corner and continue to conduct our parochial politics, to demand disarmament, compulsory courts of arbitration, permanent neutrality, etc.” (“permanent” after the Belgian fashion, no doubt?).

The petty striving of petty states to stand aside, the petty-bourgeois desire to keep as far away as possible from the great battles of world history, to take advantage of one’s relatively monopolistic position in order to remain in hide-

bound passivity — this is the *objective* social environment which may ensure the disarmament idea a certain degree of success and a certain degree of popularity in some of the small states. Of course, this striving is reactionary and entirely based on illusions; for in one way or another, imperialism draws the small states into the vortex of world economy and world politics.

In Switzerland, for example, the imperialist environment objectively prescribes *two* lines to the working-class movement: the opportunists, in alliance with the bourgeoisie, are trying to convert Switzerland into a republican-democratic monopolistic federation for obtaining profits from imperialist bourgeois tourists and to make this "tranquil" monopolistic position as profitable and as tranquil as possible.

The genuine Social-Democrats of Switzerland are striving to take advantage of the comparative freedom of Switzerland and its "international" situation to help the close alliance of the revolutionary elements of the workers' parties in Europe to achieve victory. Switzerland, thank God, has not "a separate language of its own" but three world languages, precisely those that are spoken by the adjacent belligerent countries.

If the twenty thousand members of the Swiss party were to pay a weekly levy of two centimes as a sort of "extra war tax," we would have about twenty thousand francs per annum, a sum more than sufficient to enable us periodically to publish in three languages and to distribute among the workers and soldiers of the belligerent countries — in spite of the ban of the General Staffs — all the material containing the truth about the incipient revolt of the workers, about their fraternizing in the trenches, about their hope to use

their arms in a revolutionary manner against the imperialist bourgeoisie of their "own" countries, etc.

All this is not new. This is exactly what is being done by the best papers, like *La Sentinelle*, *Volksrecht* and the *Berner Tagwacht*,³⁹ although, unfortunately, not on a sufficiently large scale. Only by such activity can the splendid decision of the Aarau Party Congress⁴⁰ become something more than merely a splendid decision.

The question that interests us now is: Does the demand for disarmament correspond to the revolutionary trend among the Swiss Social-Democrats? Obviously not. Objectively, "disarmament" is an extremely national, a specifically national programme of small states; it is certainly not the international programme of international revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Written in September 1916

Translated from German
newspaper text

First published in German in Nos. 9
and 10 of *Jugend-Internationale*,
September and October 1917
Signed: N. Lenin

First published in Russian in 1929
in the second and third editions
of Lenin's *Collected Works*,
Vol. XIX

BOURGEOIS PACIFISM AND SOCIALIST PACIFISM"

ARTICLE (OR CHAPTER) I

THE TURN IN WORLD POLITICS

There are symptoms that such a turn has taken place, or is about to take place; that is, a turn from imperialist war to imperialist peace.

The undoubtedly severe exhaustion of both imperialist coalitions; the difficulty of continuing the war any longer; the difficulty for the capitalists generally, and for finance capital in particular, to skin the people more than they have done already, in the way of outrageous "war" profits; the satiation of finance capital in the neutral countries, the United States, Holland, Switzerland, etc., which has made enormous profits out of the war and finds it difficult to continue this "profitable" business owing to the shortage of raw materials and food supplies; the strenuous efforts being made by Germany to induce one or other of the allies of her principal imperialist rival, England, to desert her; the

pacifist pronouncements of the German government followed by similar pronouncements by the governments of a number of neutral countries — these are the outstanding symptoms.

Are there any chances for a speedy cessation of the war or not?

It is very difficult to give a positive reply to this question. In our opinion, two possibilities present themselves rather definitely.

The first is the conclusion of a separate peace between Germany and Russia, although it may not be in the usual form of a formal written treaty. The second is that such a peace will not be concluded, that England and her allies are really able to hold out for another year or two, etc. If the first assumption is correct, the war will come to an end, if not immediately, then in the very near future, and no important changes in its progress can be expected. If the second assumption is correct, then the war may continue indefinitely.

We will examine the first possibility.

There is not the slightest doubt that negotiations for a separate peace between Germany and Russia have been going on quite recently, that Nicholas II himself, or an influential court clique, is in favour of such a peace, that in world politics a turn has taken place from an imperialist alliance between Russia and England against Germany, to a no less imperialist alliance between Russia and Germany against England.

The fact that Stürmer has been displaced by Trepov, the public declarations of tsarism that Russia's "right" to Constantinople has been recognized by all the Allies and the fact that Germany has set up a separate Polish state are signs that seem to indicate that the negotiations for a separate

peace have ended in failure. Perhaps tsarism entered into these negotiations *solely* in order to blackmail England, to induce her formally and unambiguously to recognize Nicholas the Bloody's "right" to Constantinople and to give certain "weighty" guarantees for this right?

In view of the fact that the main, fundamental purpose of the present imperialist war is to decide the division of the spoils among the three principal imperialist rivals, the three pirates, Russia, Germany and England, there is nothing improbable in this assumption.

On the other hand, the clearer it becomes to tsarism that it is practically impossible by military means to regain Poland, to win Constantinople, to break the iron front of Germany, which the latter is magnificently straightening out, shortening and strengthening by its recent victories in Rumania, the more tsarism is *compelled* to conclude a separate peace with Germany, *that is to say*, to abandon its imperialist alliance with England against Germany and enter into an imperialist alliance with Germany against England. Why not? Was not Russia on the verge of war with England as a consequence of the imperialist rivalry between the two powers over the division of the spoils in Central Asia? Were not negotiations carried on between England and Germany in 1898 for an alliance *against* Russia? England and Germany then secretly agreed to divide the colonies of Portugal between themselves "in the event" of Portugal not being able to meet her financial obligations!

Increased strivings on the part of the leading imperialist circles of Germany towards an alliance with Russia against England were already clearly defined several months ago. The basis of this alliance apparently is to be the partition of Galicia (tsarism deems it very important to strangle the

centre of Ukrainian agitation and Ukrainian liberty), Armenia and *perhaps Rumania*! Was there not a "hint" in a German newspaper that Rumania might be divided among Austria, Bulgaria and Russia? Germany might agree to other "small concessions" to tsarism if only she could achieve an alliance with Russia, and perhaps also with Japan, against England.

A separate peace might be concluded between Nicholas II and Wilhelm II secretly. Cases have occurred in the history of diplomacy when treaties have been concluded and, except for two or three persons, no one has known about them, not even the Cabinet Ministers. Cases have occurred in the history of diplomacy when the "Great Powers" have gathered at "European" congresses after the principal rivals had secretly decided the main questions among themselves (for example, the secret agreement between Russia and England to plunder Turkey, prior to the Berlin Congress of 1878). It would not be at all surprising if tsarism rejected a formal separate peace between the governments for the reason, among others, that in the present situation in Russia it might lead to Milyukov and Guchkov, or Milyukov and Kerensky taking over the government; but at the same time it may have concluded a secret, informal, but none the less "durable" treaty with Germany to the effect that the two "high contracting parties" undertake jointly to pursue *such and such* a policy at the forthcoming peace congress!

It is impossible to decide whether this assumption is correct or not. At all events it is a thousand times nearer to the *truth*, it is a far better description of the *truth* than the innumerable sentimental phrases that are uttered about peace between the present governments, or between any bourgeois governments for that matter, on the basis of no annexations, etc. These phrases either express innocent desires or are

hypocrisy and lies uttered for the purpose of concealing the truth. The truth at the present time, about the present war, about the present attempts to conclude peace, is the *division of the imperialist spoils*. This is the quintessence of the whole thing; and to understand this truth, to express it, "to speak the truth," is the fundamental task of socialist policy as distinct from bourgeois policy, the principal aim of which is to conceal, to gloss over this truth.

Both imperialist coalitions have grabbed a certain amount of loot, and the two principal and most powerful of the pirates, Germany and England, have grabbed most. England has not lost a foot of her territory or her colonies; but she has "acquired" the German colonies and part of Turkey (Mesopotamia). Germany has lost almost all her colonies; but she has acquired immeasurably more valuable territory in Europe, by seizing Belgium, Serbia, Rumania, part of France, part of Russia, etc. The fight now is over the division of the loot, and the "chief" of each of the pirate gangs, i.e., England and Germany, must to some degree reward his allies, who with the exception of Bulgaria and to a less extent Italy have lost a great deal. The weakest of the allies have lost most: in the English coalition, Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro and Rumania have been crushed; in the German coalition, Turkey has lost Armenia and part of Mesopotamia.

Up to now Germany has undoubtedly secured far more loot than England. Up to now Germany has won; she has proved to be far stronger than anyone anticipated before the war. Naturally, therefore, it would be to Germany's advantage to conclude peace as speedily as possible, for her rival might still be able at the most favourable opportunity conceivable (although not very probable) to mobilize a larger reserve of recruits, etc.

This is the *objective* situation. Such is the present position in the struggle for the division of the imperialist loot. It is quite natural that *this* situation should give rise to pacifist strivings, to declarations and pronouncements, mainly on the part of the bourgeoisie and the governments of the German coalition and of the neutral countries. It is equally natural that the bourgeoisie and *its* governments are compelled to exert every effort to hoodwink the people, to conceal the hideous nakedness of imperialist peace, the division of the loot, by phrases, by utterly false phrases about democratic peace, about the liberty of small nations, about reducing armaments, etc.

But while it is natural for the bourgeoisie to strive to hoodwink the people, how do the Socialists fulfil their duty? This we shall deal with in the next article (or chapter).

ARTICLE (OR CHAPTER) II

THE PACIFISM OF KAUTSKY AND TURATI

Kautsky is the most authoritative theoretician of the Second International, the most prominent leader of the so-called "Marxian centre" in Germany, the representative of the opposition which organized a separate group in the Reichstag, the "Social-Democratic Labour Group" (Haase, Ledebour and others). A number of Social-Democratic newspapers in Germany are now publishing articles by Kautsky on the terms of peace, which paraphrase the official declaration made by the "Social-Democratic Labour Group" on the German government's well-known note proposing peace negotiations. This declaration calls upon the German government to propose definite terms of peace and contains the following characteristic statement:

" In order that this note [the German Government's] may lead to peace, all countries must unequivocally renounce all thought of annexing alien territory, of the political, economic or military subjection of any people whatsoever by any other state power."

In paraphrasing and concretizing this postulate, Kautsky, in his articles, 'argues' with great thoroughness that Constantinople must not be given to Russia and that Turkey must not be made a vassal state to anyone.

We shall examine these political slogans and arguments of Kautsky and his associates as closely as possible

In a matter that affects Russia, i.e., the imperialist rival of Germany, Kautsky advances, not abstract, not "general," but a very concrete, precise and definite demand: Constantinople must not be given to Russia. By that he *exposes* the *real* imperialist designs . . . of Russia. In a matter that affects Germany, however, i.e., the country in which the majority of the party which regards Kautsky as its member (and which appointed him the editor of its principal, leading, theoretical organ, *Die Neue Zeit*) is helping the bourgeoisie and the government to conduct an imperialist war, Kautsky does *not* expose the *concrete*, imperialist designs of *his own* government, but confines himself to a "general" *desideratum* or postulate: Turkey must not be made a vassal state to anyone!!

In what way does Kautsky's policy, in substance, differ from that of the militant, so to speak, social-chauvinists (i.e., Socialists in words but chauvinists in deeds) of France and England, who, while frankly exposing the concrete imperialist actions of Germany, make shift with "general" *desiderata* or postulates when it concerns the countries or nations conquered by England and Russia, who shout about the seizure of Belgium and Serbia but say nothing about the seizure of Galicia, Armenia, the African colonies?

As a matter of fact, both the policy pursued by Kautsky and that pursued by Sembat and Henderson help *their* respective imperialist governments by concentrating attention principally on the insidiousness of their rival and enemy, while throwing a veil of vague, general phrases and sentimental wishes around the *equally* imperialist conduct of "*their own*" bourgeoisie. We would cease to be Marxists, we would cease to be Socialists generally, if we confined ourselves to the Christian, so to speak, contemplation of the benignity of

benign general phrases and refrained from exposing their *real* political significance. Do we not see the continuous spectacle of the diplomacy of all the imperialist powers flaunting magnanimous "general" phrases and "democratic" declarations in order to *screen* their robbery, violation and strangulation of small nations?

"Turkey must not be made a vassal state to anyone. . . ." If I say no more than that, I create the impression that I stand for the complete freedom of Turkey. As a matter of fact, I am only repeating a phrase that is usually uttered by German diplomats who are *deliberately* lying and deceiving, who employ this phrase in order to conceal the *fact* that Germany *has already* converted Turkey into her financial and military vassal! And if I am a German Socialist, my "general" phrases are extremely *useful* to German diplomacy, for their real significance lies in that they put German imperialism *in a good light*.

"...All countries must renounce all thought of annexations...of the economic subjection of any people whatsoever..." What magnanimity! The imperialists "renounce the thought" of annexations and of the financial strangulation of weak nations a thousand times, but should we not compare these renunciations with the *facts* which show that any one of the big banks of Germany, England, France and of the United States *do bold* small nations "*in subjection*"? Can the bourgeois government of a wealthy country *really* renounce annexations and the economic subjugation of alien peoples when billions and billions have been invested in the railways and other enterprises of weak nations?

Who really fights against annexations, etc.? Is it those who utter magnanimous phrases, the objective significance of

which is the same as that of the Christian holy water that is sprinkled on the crowned and capitalist pirates? Or is it those who explain to the workers that it is impossible to put an end to annexations and financial strangulation without overthrowing the imperialist bourgeoisie and its governments?

Here is an Italian illustration of the kind of pacifism that Kautsky preaches.

Avanti, the central organ of the Socialist Party of Italy, of December 25, 1916, contains an article by the well-known reformist, Filippo Turati, entitled "Abracadabra," in which he writes that on November 22, 1916, the Socialist group in the Italian parliament moved a resolution in favour of peace. In this resolution the group declared that "the principles proclaimed by the representatives of England and Germany were identical, and these principles should lie at the base of a possible peace," and invited "the government to open negotiations for peace through the mediation of the United States and other neutral countries." This is Turati's own account of the Socialist proposal.

On December 6, 1916, the Chamber "buries" the Socialist resolution by "adjourning" the debate on it. On December 12, the German Chancellor in the Reichstag proposes the very thing proposed by the Italian Socialists. On December 22, Wilson issues his note which, in the words of Turati, "paraphrases and repeats the ideas and arguments of the Socialist proposal." On December 23, other neutral countries come on the scene and paraphrase Wilson's note.

We are accused of having sold ourselves to the Germans, exclaimed Turati. Have Wilson and the neutral countries also sold themselves to Germany?

On December 17, Turati delivered a speech in parliament, one passage of which caused an unusual and deserved sensation. This is the passage, quoted from the report in *Avanti*:

"Suppose a discussion like that proposed by Germany is able, in the main, to settle questions like the evacuation of Belgium and France, the restoration of Rumania, Serbia and, if you will, Montenegro; I will add the rectification of the Italian frontiers in regard to what is indisputably Italian and corresponds to guarantees of a strategical character...." At this point the bourgeois and chauvinist Chamber interrupts Turati, and from all sides the shout goes up: "Excellent! So you too want all this! Long live Turati! Long live Turati! . . ."

Apparently, Turati realized that there was something wrong about the enthusiasm of these bourgeois and tried to "correct" himself and "explain":

"Gentlemen," he said, "cease this irrelevant jesting. It is one thing to admit the relevance and right of national unity, which we have always recognized, but to provoke, or justify, war for this aim is quite another thing."

But neither Turati's "explanation" nor the articles in *Avanti* in his defence, nor Turati's letter of December 21, nor the article by a certain "B.B." in the *Zürich Volksrecht* can "correct" or explain away the fact that *Turati fell into the trap!* . . . Or it would be more correct to say that not Turati, but the whole of socialist pacifism represented by Kautsky, and, as we shall see below, the French "Kautskyists," fell into the trap. The Italian bourgeois press was right in seizing upon this passage in Turati's speech and exulting over it.

The above-mentioned "B.B." tries to defend Turati by arguing that the latter referred only to "the right of nations to self-determination."

A bad defence! What has this to do with "the right of nations to self-determination," which, as everyone knows, is that part of the Marxian programme — and has always been that part of the programme of international democracy — which deals with the defence of oppressed nations? What has it to do with the imperialist war, i.e., with a war for the division of colonies, a war for the *oppression* of foreign countries, a war *among* predatory and oppressing powers to decide *which* of them shall oppress *more* foreign nations?

In what way does this argument about self-determination of nations in defence of an imperialist war, and not a national war, differ from the speeches delivered by Alexinsky, Hervé and Hyndman who argue that *republican* France is opposed to monarchical Germany, in spite of the fact that everyone knows that this war has nothing to do with the conflict between republican and monarchist principles, but is a war for the division of colonies, etc., between two imperialist coalitions.

Turati explained and pleaded that he does not "justify" the war *in the least*.

We will take the reformist, Kautskyan Turati's word for it that he did not *intend* to justify the war. But who does not know that in politics it is not intentions that count, but deeds, not good desires, but facts, not the imaginary, but the real?

Suppose we admit that Turati did not want to justify the war and that Kautsky did not want to justify Germany's placing Turkey in the position of a vassal to German imperialism; the *fact* remains that these two benign pacifists *did justify the war!* That is the point. Had Kautsky declared that "Constantinople must not be given to Russia, Turkey must not be made a vassal state to anyone" not in a

magazine which is so dull that nobody reads it, but in parliament, before a lively, impressionable, bourgeois audience, full of southern temperament, it would not have been surprising if the witty bourgeois had exclaimed: "Excellent! Hear! Long live Kautsky!"

Whether he wished to or not, deliberately or not, the fact is that Turati expressed the point of view of a bourgeois broker proposing a friendly deal between imperialist pirates. The "liberation" of Italian soil belonging to Austria would, *in fact*, be a concealed reward to the Italian bourgeoisie for participating in the imperialist war of a gigantic imperialist coalition; it would be a small sop thrown in, in addition to the share of the African colonies and spheres of influence in Dalmatia and Albania. Perhaps the reformist Turati adopts the point of view of the bourgeoisie naturally; but Kautsky really differs in no way from Turati.

In order not to embellish the imperialist war, in order not to help the bourgeoisie falsely to represent this war as a national war, as a war for the liberation of nations, in order to avoid taking up the position of bourgeois reformism, one must speak, not in the language of Kautsky and Turati, but in the language of Karl Liebknecht: one must tell *one's own* bourgeois that they are hypocrites when they talk about national liberation, one must say that this war cannot result in a democratic peace unless the proletariat "turns its guns" against *its own* governments.

Such and only such could be the position of a genuine Marxist, of a genuine Socialist and not a bourgeois reformist. It is not he who repeats the general, meaningless, non-committal, goody-goody desires of pacifism who really works for a democratic peace but it is he who exposes the imperialist character of the present war and of the imperialist peace

that is being prepared, he who calls upon the peoples to rise in revolt against the criminal governments.

Some people sometimes try to defend Kautsky and Turati with the argument that it is impossible openly to do more than drop "hints" against the government and that the pacifists of this sort do "hint" at this kind of thing. The reply to this is, first, that the impossibility of speaking the truth openly is an argument, not in favour of concealing the truth, but in favour of the need for an illegal organization and press, i.e., an organization and press free from the surveillance of the police and the censorship. Secondly, that moments occur in history when a Socialist *is called upon* to throw off all legality. Thirdly, that even in serf-ridden Russia, Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky managed to speak the truth, for example, by their silent comment on the Manifesto of March 3 (February 19), 1861, and the ridicule and abuse they hurled against the liberals of their day who made exactly the same kind of speeches as those made today by Turati and Kautsky.

In the next article we shall deal with French pacifism, which found expression in the resolutions passed by the two recently held congresses of the labour and Socialist organizations of France.

ARTICLE (OR CHAPTER) III
THE PACIFISM OF THE FRENCH SOCIALISTS
AND SYNDICALISTS

The congresses of the C.G.T. (Confédération générale du Travail)⁴² of France and of the Socialist Party of France⁴³ have just been held. At these congresses the true significance and true role of Socialist pacifism at the present moment were quite definitely revealed.

The following is the resolution passed *unanimously* at the trade union congress, including the majority of the ardent chauvinists headed by the notorious Jouhaux, the anarchist Broutchoux and . . . the "Zimmerwaldian" Merrheim:

"This Conference of National Corporative Federations, trade unions and labour exchanges takes cognizance of the Note of the President of the United States which 'invites all nations now at war with each other to publicly expound their views as to the terms upon which the war might be brought to an end' —

"requests the French government to agree to this proposal;

"invites the government to take the initiative in making a similar proposal to its allies in order to speed the hour of peace;

"declares that the federation of nations, which is one of the guarantees of a final peace, can be achieved only with the

independence, territorial inviolability and political and economic liberty of all nations, great and small.

"The organizations represented at this conference pledge themselves to support and spread this idea among the masses of the workers in order to bring an end to the present indefinite and ambiguous situation, which can only benefit secret diplomacy, against which the working class has always protested."

There you have an example of "pure" pacifism, entirely in the spirit of Kautsky, a pacifism approved by an official labour organization which has nothing in common with Marxism, and the majority of whose members are chauvinists. We have before us an outstanding document, deserving the most serious attention, of the *political* unity of the chauvinists and the "Kautskyists" on a platform of empty pacifist phrases. In the preceding article we tried to explain the *theoretical* basis of the unity of ideas of the chauvinists and the pacifists, of the bourgeois and the Socialist reformists. Now we see this unity achieved *in practice*, in another imperialist country.

At the conference at Zimmerwald, September 5-9, 1915, Merrheim declared: "*Le parti, les Jouhaux, le gouvernement, ce ne sont que trois têtes sous un bonnet*" (The party, the Jouhaux and the government are three heads under one bonnet, i.e., they are all one). At the conference of the C.G.T. of December 26, 1916, Merrheim voted *together with Jouhaux*, for a pacifist resolution. On December 23, 1916, one of the frankest and most extreme organs of the German social-imperialists, the Chemnitz *Volksstimme*, published a leading article entitled "The Disintegration of the Bourgeois Parties and the Restoration of Social-Democratic Unity." In this article, of course, the praises are sung of the peace-loving Südekum, Legien, Scheidemann and Co., of the whole of the

majority of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and also of the German government, and it is proclaimed that: "the first Party congress that is convened after the war must restore Party unity, with the exception of the few fanatics who refuse to pay Party dues" (i.e., the adherents of Karl Liebknecht!); ". . . Party unity on the basis of the policy of the Executive of the Party, of the Social-Democratic Reichstag group and of the trade unions."

This is a very clear expression of the idea and the proclamation of the policy of "unity" between the obvious social-chauvinists of Germany and Kautsky and Co., the "Social-Democratic Labour Group" — unity on the basis of pacifist phrases — "unity" as achieved in France on December 26, 1916, between Jouhaux and Merrheim!

The central organ of the Socialist Party of Italy, *Avanti*, in a leading article in its issue of December 28, 1916, writes:

"Although Bissolati and Südekum, Bonhommi and Scheidemann, Sembat and David, Jouhaux and Legien have deserted to the camp of bourgeois nationalism and have betrayed [*banno tradito*] the ideological unity of the internationalists, which they promised to serve faithfully and loyally, we shall stay together with our German comrades like Liebknecht, Ledebour, Hoffmann, Meyer, and with our French comrades like Merrheim, Blanc, Brizon, Raffin-Dugens, who have not changed and have not vacillated."

Note the confusion that is expressed here:

Bissolati and Bonhommi were *expelled* from the Socialist Party of Italy as reformists and chauvinists before the outbreak of the war. *Avanti* puts them on the same level as Südekum and Legien, and quite rightly, of course; but Südekum, David and Legien are at the head of the alleged Social-Democratic Party of Germany, which, in fact, is a

social-chauvinist party, and yet this very *Avanti* is opposed to their expulsion, opposed to a rupture with them, and opposed to the formation of a Third International. *Avanti* quite correctly describes Legien and Jouhaux as deserters to the camp of bourgeois nationalism and contrasts their conduct with that of Liebknecht, Ledebour, Merrheim and Brizon. But we have seen that Merrheim votes on the same side as Jouhaux, while Legien, in the Chemnitz *Volksstimme*, declares that he is confident that Party unity will be restored, with the single exception, however, of the adherents of Liebknecht, i.e., "unity" with the Social-Democratic Labour Group (including Kautsky) to which Ledebour belongs!!

This confusion arises from the fact that *Avanti* confuses bourgeois pacifism with revolutionary Social-Democratic internationalism, while experienced politicians like Legien and Jouhaux perfectly well understand the identity of Socialist and bourgeois pacifism.

Why, indeed, should not M. Jouhaux and his organ, the chauvinist *La Bataille*,⁴⁴ rejoice at the unanimity" between Jouhaux and Merrheim when, in fact, the unanimously adopted resolution, which we have quoted in full above, contains nothing but bourgeois pacifist phrases, *not a shadow* of revolutionary consciousness, *not a single* socialist idea!

Is it not ridiculous to talk about "the economic liberty of all nations great and small" and yet not say a word about the fact that, until the bourgeois governments are overthrown and the bourgeoisie expropriated, the phrase 'the economic liberty' of nations is just as much a *deception* of the people as the phrase "the economic liberty" of the individual in general, of the small peasants and the rich peasants, of the workers and the capitalists, in modern society?

The resolution which Jouhaux and Merrheim voted for unanimously is thoroughly imbued with the very ideas of "bourgeois nationalism" which Jouhaux expresses, as *Avants* quite rightly points out, while, strangely enough, *failing* to observe that Merrheim expresses the same ideas

Bourgeois nationalists always and everywhere flaunt "general phrases about a 'federation of nations' *in general* and about 'economic liberty of all nations great and small'" But Socialists, unlike the bourgeois nationalists, have always said and now say rhetoric about "economic liberty of all nations great and small" is disgusting hypocrisy as long as *certain* nations (for example, England and France) invest abroad, that is to say, lend at usurious interest to small and backward nations *scores and scores of billions of francs*, and as long as the small and weak nations are in bondage to them

Socialists could not have allowed *a single sentence* of the resolution, for which Jouhaux and Merrheim voted unanimously, to pass without strong protest. In direct contrast to that resolution, Socialists would have declared that Wilson's pronouncement is a down-right lie and sheer hypocrisy, because Wilson is the representative of a bourgeoisie which has piled up billions out of the war, because he is the head of a government that has frantically armed the United States obviously in preparation for a *second* great imperialist war, that the French bourgeois government is tied hand and foot by finance capital, whose slave it is, and by the secret, imperialist, thoroughly predatory and reactionary treaties with England, Russia, etc., and therefore cannot do or say anything except utter the same lies about a democratic and a "just" peace, that the struggle for such a peace cannot be waged by repeating general, vapid, benign, sentimental,

meaningless and non-committal pacifist phrases, which merely serve to embellish the foulness of imperialism; it can be waged only by telling the people the *truth*, by telling the people that, in order to obtain a democratic and just peace, the bourgeois governments of all the belligerent countries must be overthrown, and that for this purpose advantage must be taken of the fact that millions of the workers are armed and that the high cost of living and the horrors of the imperialist war have roused the anger of the masses of the population.

This is what Socialists should have said instead of voting for the Jouhaux-Merrheim resolution.

The Congress of the Socialist Party of France, which took place in Paris simultaneously with that of the C.G.T., not only refrained from saying this, but passed a resolution that is *even worse* than the one mentioned above. This resolution was passed by 2,838 votes against 109, while 20 abstained, that is to say, by a *bloc* between the social-chauvinists (Renaudel and Co., the so-called "majoritaires") and the *Longuet-ists* (the adherents of Longuet, the French Kautskyists)!! Moreover, the Zimmerwaldian Bourderon and the Kienthalian Raffin-Dugens voted for this resolution!!

We shall not quote the full text of this resolution because it is inordinately long and totally uninteresting: it contains benign, sentimental phrases about peace, *immediately followed* by declarations of readiness to continue to support the so-called "national defence" of France, i.e., to support the imperialist war which France is conducting in alliance with bigger and more powerful pirates like England and Russia.

Unity between the social-chauvinists and the pacifists (or Kautskyists) and a section of the Zimmerwaldists in France has become a fact, not only in the C.G.T., but also in the Socialist Party.

ARTICLE (OR CHAPTER) IV
ZIMMERWALD AT THE CROSS-ROADS

The French newspapers containing the report of the Congress of the C G T were received in Berne on December 28, and on December 30 the Socialist newspapers of Berne and Zürich published another manifesto issued by the Berne I S K ('Internationale Sozialistische Kommission'), the International Socialist Committee, the executive body of Zimmerwald. This manifesto, dated the end of December 1916, refers to the peace proposals made by Germany and by Wilson and the other neutral countries, and all these governmental pronouncements are described, and quite rightly described, of course, as a "farical game of peace," "a game to deceive their own peoples," "hypocritical pacifist gesticulations of diplomats."

As against this farce and falsehood the manifesto declares that the "only force" capable of bringing about peace, etc., is the "firm determination of the international proletarians to turn their weapons, not against their brothers, but against the enemy in their own country."

The passages we have quoted clearly reveal the two fundamentally distinct policies which have lived side by side, as it were, up to now in the Zimmerwald group, but which have now finally parted company.

On the one hand Turati quite definitely and correctly states that the proposals made by Germany, Wilson, etc.,

were a "*paraphrase*" of Italian "Socialist" pacifism, the declarations of the German social-chauvinists and the voting of the French have shown that both fully appreciate the value of the pacifist screen for *their* policy

On the other hand, the manifesto of the International Socialist Committee describes the pacifism of all belligerent and neutral governments as a farce and hypocrisy

On the one hand, Jouhaux joins with Merrheim, Bordenon, Longuet and Raffin-Dugens join with Renaudel, Sembat and Thomas, while the German social-chauvinists, Sudekum, David and Scheidemann, announce the forthcoming "restoration of Social-Democratic unity" with Kautsky and the "Social-Democratic Labour Group"

On the other hand the manifesto of the International Socialist Committee calls upon the "Socialist minorities" to fight strenuously against 'their own governments' and "against their social-patriotic hirelings" (*Söldlinge*)

Either one thing or the other

Either expose the vapidty, stupidity and hypocrisy of bourgeois pacifism, *or* "*paraphrase*" it into "Socialist" pacifism. Fight against the Jouhaux, the Renaudels, the Legiens and the Davids as the "hirelings" of the governments, *or* join with them in making empty pacifist declamations on the French or German models

This is now the dividing line between the Right wing of Zimmerwald, which has always strenuously opposed a split from the social-chauvinists, and the Left wing, which had the foresight at the Zimmerwald Conference publicly to dissociate itself from the Right and to put forward, at the conference and after it in the press, its own platform. The approach of peace, or at least the intense discussion of the question of peace by certain bourgeois elements, not accidentally, but

inevitably gave rise to a particularly marked divergence between the two policies. Bourgeois pacifists and their "Socialist" imitators, or followers, have always pictured, and now picture, peace as being something in principle distinct from war, for the pacifists of both shades have never understood that "war is the continuation of the politics of peace and peace is the continuation of the politics of war." Neither the bourgeoisie nor the social-chauvinists wanted, nor do they wish to see that the imperialist war of 1914-17 is the continuation of the imperialist politics of 1898-1914, if not of an earlier period. Neither the bourgeois pacifists nor the Socialist pacifists see that if the bourgeois governments are not overthrown by revolution peace now can only be an imperialist peace, a continuation of the imperialist war.

In the same way as they approached the question of appraising the present war with silly, vulgar, philistine phrases about aggression or defence in general, so they are approaching the question of appraising the peace with the same philistine commonplaces, forgetting all about the concrete historical situation, the actual concrete struggle between the imperialist powers. And it was quite natural for the social-chauvinists, these agents of the governments and of the bourgeoisie in the workers' parties, to seize upon the approach of peace, or even upon mere peace talk, in order to *gloss over* the depths of their reformism and opportunism which the war has exposed and in order to restore their damaged influence over the masses. Hence, the social-chauvinists in Germany and in France, as we have seen, are making strenuous efforts to "unite" with the soft, unprincipled pacifist section of the "opposition."

No doubt, efforts will be made also in Zimmerwald to gloss over the divergence between the two irreconcilable lines of

policy. One can foresee these efforts being made along two lines. A "practical business" conciliation will take the form of mechanically combining loud revolutionary phrases (like those in the manifesto of the International Socialist Committee) with opportunist and pacifist practice. This is what happened in the Second International. The arch-revolutionary phrases in the manifestoes of Huysmans and Vandervelde and in certain congress resolutions merely served as a screen for the arch-opportunist practice of the majority of the European Parties, but they did not change, disrupt or combat this practice. It is doubtful whether these tactics will again be successful in Zimmerwald.

The "conciliators in principle" will strive to falsify Marxism by advancing such arguments: reform does not exclude revolution; an imperialist peace with certain "improvements" in the frontiers of certain nationalities, or in international law, or in expenditure on armaments, etc., is possible side by side with the revolutionary movement as "one of the aspects of the development" of this movement, and so on and so forth.

This would be a falsification of Marxism. Of course, reforms do not exclude revolution. But this is not the point at issue at the present moment. The point is that revolutionaries must not efface *themselves* before the reformists, i.e., that Socialists should not substitute reformist work for their revolutionary work. Europe is experiencing a revolutionary situation. The war and the high cost of living are making this situation more acute. The transition from war to peace will not necessarily alter this situation, for there are no grounds whatever for believing that the millions of workers who now have excellent weapons in their hands will necessarily permit themselves to be "peacefully disarmed" by the

bourgeoisie instead of following the advice of Karl Liebknecht, i.e., turning their weapons against *their own* bourgeoisie.

The question is not as it is put by the pacifist Kautskyists: either a reformist political campaign or else the renunciation of reforms. This is a bourgeois presentation of the question. The question is: either revolutionary struggle, the by-product of which, in the event of its not being quite successful, is reforms (the whole history of revolutions throughout the world has proved this), or nothing but talk about reforms and the promise of reforms.

The reformism of Kautsky, Turati and Bourderon, which now comes out in the form of pacifism, not only leaves aside the question of revolution (this *in itself* is a betrayal of socialism), not only abandons in practice all systematic and persistent revolutionary work, but even goes to the length of declaring that organizing street demonstrations is the work of adventurers (Kautsky in *Die Neue Zeit*, November 26, 1915). It goes to the length of advocating unity and uniting with the outspoken and determined opponents of revolutionary struggle, the Südekums, Legiens, Renaudels, Thomases, etc., etc.

This reformism is absolutely irreconcilable with revolutionary Marxism, the duty of which is to take the utmost possible advantage of the present revolutionary situation in Europe in order openly to preach revolution, the overthrow of the bourgeois governments, the conquest of power by the armed proletariat, while at the same time not renouncing and not refusing to utilize reforms for the purpose of developing the revolutionary struggle and in the course of that struggle.

The immediate future will reveal how the progress of events in Europe in general, and the struggle between

reformist pacifism and revolutionary Marxism, in particular, including the struggle between the two sections of Zimmerwald, will develop.

Zurich, January 1, 1917.

First published in 1924 in
Lenin Miscellany II
Signed: N. L.

Published according to
the manuscript

NOTES

¹ The pamphlet *Socialism and War* was published in German in September 1915 and distributed among the delegates to the Zimmerwald Socialist Conference. In 1916 it was published in French. p. 1

² See V. I. Lenin, "The War and Russian Social-Democracy," *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2, pp. 397-406.

Sotsial-Demokrat — central organ of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, published as an underground newspaper from February 1908 to January 1917. Altogether 58 issues appeared — the first in Russia, the rest abroad: at Paris and, later, at Geneva. The *Sotsial-Demokrat* published more than 80 articles and other items by Lenin, who became its editor in December 1911. It also carried a large number of articles by Stalin. p. 1

³ See V. I. Lenin, "Conference of the Sections of the R.S.D.L.P. Abroad," *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1944, Vol. V, pp. 131-57.

The Berne Conference — a conference of the sections of the R.S.D.L.P. abroad held in Berne, Switzerland, from February 27 to March 4, 1915. Called on Lenin's initiative, it had the standing of a Bolshevik general Party conference, since it was impossible to convene an all-Russian conference during the war. Representatives were present at the conference from the Bolshevik sections in Paris, Zurich, Geneva, Berne, Lausanne, and from the "Baugy" group. Lenin represented the Central Committee and the central organ (*Sotsial-Demokrat*), directed the proceedings of the conference, and made a report on the main item on the agenda, "The War and the Tasks of the Party." The conference adopted resolutions on the war that were drafted by Lenin. p. 1

⁴*The Zimmerwald Conference*—the first conference of internationalist socialists, held in Zimmerwald, Switzerland, on September 5-8, 1915. A struggle flared up at the conference between the Kautskyite majority and the revolutionary internationalists headed by Lenin. At the conference, Lenin organized the internationalists into the Zimmerwald Left group, in which the Bolsheviks alone adhered to the only correct and consistently internationalist stand against the war.

The conference adopted a manifesto which exposed the imperialist nature of the world war, denounced the "Socialists" for voting for war credits and for participating in the bourgeois governments and called on the workers of the European countries to wage struggles against the war and to strive for the conclusion of peace without annexation or payment of indemnities.

The conference also adopted a resolution expressing sympathy for war victims and elected the International Socialist Committee (I.S.C.). For an appraisal of the conference, see Lenin's articles "The First Step" and "Revolutionary Marxists at the International Socialist Conference, September 5-8, 1915" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., International Publishers, New York, 1930, Vol. XVIII, pp. 340-45, 346-49). p. 3

⁵See Karl von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege*, Berlin, 1917, Vol. I, p. 34. p. 11

⁶*The Basle Manifesto* on the war issue was unanimously adopted at the special congress of the Second International held on November 24-25, 1912, at Basle, Switzerland. The manifesto revealed the predatory aims of the war the imperialists were preparing and urged workers everywhere resolutely to combat the war danger. The manifesto proposed that in the event of an imperialist war breaking out, Socialists should take advantage of the economic and political crisis to precipitate the socialist revolution. (On the Basle Manifesto, see also V. I. Lenin, "The Collapse of the Second International," *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., International Publishers, New York, 1930, Vol. XVIII, pp. 273-82.)

At the Basle Congress Kautsky, Vandervelde and the other leaders of the Second International voted for the Manifesto, but as soon as the world war broke out in 1914, they went back on it, and sided with their imperialist governments. p. 13

⁷*The Stuttgart International Socialist Congress*, held on August 18-24, 1907. At this congress the R.S.D.L.P. was represented by 37 delegates. Lenin, Lunacharsky, Litvinov and others represented the Bolsheviks.

Most of the work of the congress was conducted in commissions, which drafted resolutions for submission to the plenary sessions. Lenin was a member of the commission that drafted the resolution on "Militarism and International Conflicts." Jointly with Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin moved his historic amendment to Bebel's resolution, declaring that it was the duty of Socialists to take advantage of the crisis brought about by war to rouse the masses for the overthrow of capitalism. The congress accepted this amendment. (On the congress see V. I. Lenin, "The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart," *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1943, Vol. IV, pp. 314-23, and *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. XIII, pp. 59-65.) p. 19

⁸ *The voting on August 4* — on August 4, 1914, the Social-Democratic group in the German Reichstag voted in favour of granting the government of Wilhelm II war credits and for supporting the imperialist war. The leaders of German Social-Democracy betrayed the working class and took up the position of social-chauvinism and of defence of their imperialist bourgeoisie. p. 20

⁹ *Struveism* — see pp. 48-49 of this book. p. 20

¹⁰ *Brentanismo* — a bourgeois reformist theory which "recognized the 'school of capitalism', but rejected the school of the revolutionary class struggle" (Lenin). Lujo Brentano, a German bourgeois economist, advocate of so-called "State Socialism," tried to prove that it was possible to achieve social equality within the capitalist system by means of reforms and the conciliation of the interests of the capitalists and the workers. Under the cloak of Marxist phraseology, Brentano and his followers tried to subordinate the working-class movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie. p. 20

¹¹ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Der Sozialismus in Deutschland," *Collected Works*, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1963, Vol. XXII, p. 251. p. 24

¹² *Novosti (News)* — a daily Socialist-Revolutionary Party newspaper published in Paris from August 1914 to May 1915. p. 30

¹³ *Proletarsky Golos (Proletarian Voice)* — a newspaper, organ of the St. Petersburg Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., published underground from February 1915 to December 1916. Four numbers appeared. Its first issue published the manifesto of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. entitled: "The War and Russian Social-Democracy." p. 32

¹⁴ This refers to a conference of Italian and Swiss Socialists held in Lugano, Switzerland, on September 27, 1914. p. 39

¹⁵ *The Copenhagen Conference of Socialists in neutral countries* (Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Holland) was held on January 17-18, 1915 for the purpose of restoring the Second International. The conference resolved to appeal, through the parliamentary representatives of the Socialist Parties in the neutral countries, to their governments to act as intermediaries between the belligerent powers and secure the cessation of the war. p. 39

¹⁶ *The International Socialist Women's Conference* on the attitude to be taken towards the war was held in Berne, Switzerland, on March 26-28, 1915. The conference was convened on the initiative of the women's organizations connected with the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. in conjunction with Clara Zetkin, the leader of the international women's movement. Twenty-five delegates were present at the conference, representing England, Germany, France, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Russia and Poland. Among the delegates from Russia were N. K. Krupskaya and Inessa Armand.

A report of the proceedings of the International Socialist Women's Conference was published as a supplement to the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat*, No. 42, of June 1, 1915. p. 39

¹⁷ *The International Socialist Youth Conference* on the attitude to be taken towards the war was held in Berne, Switzerland, on April 4-6, 1915. Representatives were present from youth organizations of ten countries: Russia, Norway, Holland, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Germany, Poland, Italy, Denmark and Sweden. The conference decided to celebrate International Youth Day every year and elected an international Bureau of Socialist Youth which, in conformity with the conference's decision, began to publish the magazine *Jugend-Internationale* (*Youth International*), to which Lenin and Karl Liebknecht contributed. p. 39

¹⁸ *The Independent Labour Party* was formed in 1893 under such leaders as James Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald. It claimed to be politically independent of the bourgeois parties; actually it was "independent of Socialism, but dependent upon liberalism" (Lenin). At the beginning of the imperialist world war (1914-18) the Independent Labour Party issued a manifesto against the war on August 13, 1914, but later, at the London Conference of Entente Socialists in February 1915, its representatives supported the social-chauvinist resolution adopted by that conference. From that time onward, the I.L.P. leaders, under cover of pacifist phrases, adopted a social-chauvinist position. With the formation of the Communist International in 1919, the I.L.P. leaders, yielding to the pressure of the rank and file, which had swung to the left,

resolved to withdraw from the Second International. In 1921, the I.L.P. joined the so-called Two-and-a-Half International, and after its collapse re-affiliated to the Second International.

p. 42

¹⁹ *Tesnyaki* — the revolutionary Social-Democratic Labour Party of Bulgaria, was formed in 1903 after a breakaway from the Social-Democratic Party. Dimitr Blagoyev, founder and leader of the *Tesnyaki*, was succeeded by his followers Georgi Dimitrov and Vasil Kolarov. During 1914-18, the *Tesnyaki* opposed the imperialist war. In 1919 it affiliated to the Communist International and formed the Communist Party of Bulgaria.

p. 43

²⁰ *The British Socialist Party* was formed in 1911. It conducted Marxist propaganda and agitation and was described by Lenin as "not opportunist," and as "really independent of the Liberals." Its small membership and isolation from the masses lent the party a somewhat sectarian character.

During the imperialist world war (1914-18), two trends were revealed in the party: one openly social-chauvinist, headed by Henry Hyndman, and the other internationalist, headed by Albert Inkpin and others. In April 1916 a split took place. Hyndman and his supporters found themselves in the minority and withdrew from the party. From that moment the internationalists assumed the leadership of the British Socialist Party, which later initiated the formation of the Communist Party of Great Britain in 1920.

p. 43

²¹ *The Tribunists* — a Left group in the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Holland which in 1907 published the newspaper *De Tribune*. In 1909, the *Tribunists* were expelled from the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Holland and organized an independent party (the Social-Democratic Party of Holland). The *Tribunists* were not a consistently revolutionary party, but they represented the Left wing of the working-class movement of Holland.

In 1918 the *Tribunists* formed the Communist Party of Holland. From 1909, *De Tribune* was the organ of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland, and from 1918 it was the organ of the Communist Party. From the beginning of the 30's to 1940 it came out under the title of *Folksdagblad* (*The People's Daily*).

p. 43

²² *Iskra* (*The Spark*), founded by Lenin in 1900, was the first all-Russian, Marxist newspaper published underground. After the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. it became the central organ of the Party. In speaking of the old *Iskra*, Lenin is referring to *Iskra* from No. 1 to

No. 51. With No. 52, the Mensheviks converted the paper into their factional organ. p. 48

²³ *The January Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., 1912* — this refers to the Sixth All-Russian Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. which took place in Prague on January 5-17, 1912. By decision of the conference the Mensheviks were expelled from the Party, and the formal unity of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks within one party was ended forever. The Prague Conference inaugurated the Bolshevik Party, a party of a new type (see *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [Bolsheviks]*, *Short Course*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1951, pp. 217-23).

p. 50

²⁴ *Luch (The Ray)* — the daily newspaper of the liquidator-Mensheviks, published legally in St. Petersburg from September 1912 to July 1913. It was maintained "by funds provided by rich friends among the bourgeoisie" (Lenin).

p. 50

²⁵ *"Marxism and Liquidationism — a Collection of Articles on the Fundamental Problems of the Present-Day Working-Class Movement. Part II"*, published by the Party Publishing House *Priboi* in July 1914. It contained articles by Lenin against the Liquidators. In referring to this book, Lenin has in mind his articles: "The Working Class and the Workers' Press" and "The Workers' Response to the Formation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Group in the State Duma" (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. XX, pp. 338-45, 503-09).

p. 51

²⁶ *The Leipzig People's Paper (Leipziger Volkszeitung)*, organ of the Left wing of the German Social-Democratic Party. Published daily from 1894 to 1933. For a long time Franz Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg were members of its editorial board. From 1917 to 1922 the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* was the organ of the German "independents." In 1922 it became the organ of the Right-wing Social-Democrats.

p. 51

²⁷ *An* — N. N. Jordania, leader of the Caucasian Mensheviks. p. 55

²⁸ *Internationale Korrespondenz* — a weekly run by German social-chauvinists which dealt with problems of international politics and the working-class movement. Published in Berlin from 1914 to 1917.

p. 55

²⁹ *Sovremenny Mir (The Contemporary World)* — a literary, scientific and political monthly published in St. Petersburg from 1906 to 1918. The Mensheviks, including G. V. Plekhanov, were frequent contributors. Bolsheviks also contributed to the magazine during the period of the

bloc with Plekhanov's group of pro-Party Mensheviks, and in the beginning of 1914.

In March 1914, the magazine published Lenin's article "Socialism Annihilated Once Again" (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. XX, pp. 167-88). During the imperialist world war (1914-18), it became the organ of the social-chauvinists. p. 33

³⁰ "The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution" was written in German in September 1916 and meant for publication in the Scandinavian Left Social-Democratic Press. During the imperialist world war (1914-18) the Left Social-Democrats were opposed to the "armed nation" clause in the Party programme and put forward the erroneous "disarmament" slogan.

In December 1916, Lenin re-edited his article and had it published in *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata*, No. 2, under the title of "The 'Disarmament' Slogan" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., International Publishers, New York, 1942, Vol. XIX, pp. 332-61).

In April 1917, shortly before he left for Russia, Lenin gave the original German text to the editorial board of *Jugend-Internationale* (*Youth International*). The article appeared in the journal in Nos. 9 and 10, 1917.

Jugend-Internationale, organ of the International League of Socialist Youth Organizations affiliated to the Zimmerwald Left; founded in Zurich in September 1915 and stopped publication in May 1918. For an appraisal of *Jugend-Internationale*, see the review, "The Youth International" (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1944, Vol. V, pp. 241-45). p. 38

³¹ Reference is to the *Theses on the War Question*, drafted by Robert Grimm, one of the leaders of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, in the summer of 1916 for the extraordinary congress of the Party scheduled to be held in February 1917 to decide the Party's attitude towards the war. p. 38

³² *Neues Leben* (*New Life*) — a monthly journal of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party published in Berne from January 1915 to December 1917. It represented the views of the Zimmerwald Right and early in 1917 took up a social-chauvinist position. p. 38

³³ *Junius*, the pseudonym of Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919). p. 39

³⁴ See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, FLPH, Moscow, undated, p. 423. p. 61

³⁵ G. A. A. de Galliffet (1840-1909), a French general notorious for his ruthless suppression of the Paris Commune in 1871. p. 62

²⁶ Reference is to the international socialist conferences at Zimmerwald and Kienthal.

For the Zimmerwald Conference see Note 4 of the present book.

The second Conference of International Socialists was held on April 24-30, 1916 in Kienthal, a village near Berne. At this conference, the Left wing was much stronger than at the earlier Zimmerwald Conference. By insistence on the part of Lenin, the conference adopted a resolution criticizing social pacifism and the opportunist activities of the International Socialist Bureau. The manifesto and resolution adopted at Kienthal marked a further step forward in the development of the international anti-war movement.

The Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences helped to sort out the internationalist elements and unite them, but they failed to take a consistent internationalist position and adopt the basic principles of Bolshevik policy: convert the imperialist war into civil war; defeat one's own imperialist government in the war; organize the Third International. p. 66

²⁷ *The Social-Democratic Labour Group* (Arbeitsgemeinschaft) — an organization of German Centrists founded in March 1916 by Reichstag members who had broken with the Social-Democratic Reichstag group. It became the backbone of the centrist Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, founded in 1917. The new party sought to justify avowed social-chauvinists and advocated preservation of unity with them. p. 67

²⁸ *The War Industries Committees* were established in Russia in 1915 by the imperialist, big bourgeoisie. In an attempt to bring the workers under their influence and foster chauvinist sentiments among them, the bourgeoisie decided to organize "workers' groups" in these committees. It was to the advantage of the bourgeoisie to have on these committees representatives of the workers who would urge the working-class masses to increase productivity of labour in the war industry. The Mensheviks took an active part in this pseudo-patriotic scheme of the bourgeoisie. The Bolsheviks advocated a boycott of the War Industry Committees and, with the support of the overwhelming majority of the workers, were successful in securing this boycott (see *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [Bolsheviks], Short Course*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1951, pp. 264-65). p. 67

²⁹ *La Sentinelle* — organ of the Swiss Social-Democratic organization of Neuchâtel Canton, French Switzerland, published at La Chaux-de-Fonds in 1884. It followed an internationalist policy in the early years of the imperialist world war (1914-18) and in its November 13, 1914 issue (No. 265)

carried an abridged version of the Manifesto of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., "The War and Russian Social-Democracy" (see V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2, pp. 397-406).

Volksrecht (*People's Right*) — a daily newspaper, organ of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party and Social-Democratic organization of Zurich Canton, founded in Zurich in 1898. During the imperialist world war (1914-18), it published articles by Left Zimmerwaldists, and several by Lenin including "Twelve Brief Theses on H. Greulich's Defence of Fatherland Defence," "Tasks of the R.S.D.L.P. in the Russian Revolution" and "Tricks of the Republican Chauvinists." Later, *Volksrecht* adopted an anti-Communist and anti-democratic position.

Berner Tagwacht — an organ of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, founded in 1893 in Bern. It published articles by Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring and other Left socialists in the early days of the First World War. In 1917, it came out in open support of the social-chauvinists. Later, it took an anti-Communist and anti-democratic position. p. 72

⁴⁰ This refers to the congress of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, held in Aarau, on November 20-21, 1915. The chief item on the agenda was the question of what attitude the Swiss Social-Democratic Party should take towards the Zimmerwald Union of internationalists. On this issue there was a conflict among the three trends in the party: (1) the anti-Zimmerwaldists (Greulich, Pfleger and others), (2) the supporters of the Zimmerwald Right (Grimm and others) and (3) the supporters of the Zimmerwald Left (Platten and others).

Robert Grimm tabled a resolution proposing that the Swiss Social-Democratic Party should join the Zimmerwald Union and approve the political line of the Zimmerwald Right. The Left wing of the party moved an amendment to Grimm's resolution urging the necessity of launching a mass revolutionary struggle against the war and declaring that only a victorious proletarian revolution could put an end to imperialist war.

The congress carried the Left-wing amendment by a majority vote.

p. 72

⁴¹ Lenin intended the article "Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism" for the newspaper *Novy Mir* (*New World*) published in New York by Russian socialist émigrés. The article did not appear in *Novy Mir* and Lenin re-edited the first two sections which were published in the last issue (No. 58) of the *Sotsial-Demokrat*, January 31, 1917, under the

heading "A Turn in World Politics" (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., International Publishers, New York, 1942, Vol. XIX, pp. 423-31).

p. 73

⁴² The French *Confédération générale du Travail* (General Confederation of Labour) was founded in 1895. Its nucleus of leadership sided with the imperialists in the imperialist world war (1914-18) and advocated class collaboration and "defence of the fatherland."

p. 87

⁴³ *The Socialist Party of France* was founded in 1902. On the initiative of the Socialist Party of France and the French Socialist Party, a unified Socialist Party was organized in 1905, which included members of the various Socialist Parties and groups (Guesdists, Blanquists, Jauresists and others). The leadership of the party passed into the hands of the social-reformists headed by Jauresists. During the imperialist world war (1914-18), the party adopted a social-chauvinist position; its parliamentary group voted for war credits and its representatives participated in the bourgeois government. A split occurred at the Tyre Congress of the Party held on December 25-30, 1920. The majority organized the Communist Party of France, while the minority Right opportunists, headed by Léon Blum, withdrew from the congress and became an independent party which went under the old name of the Socialist Party of France. After the Second World War, the leadership of the Socialist Party of France, headed by Léon Blum, collaborated with the French reactionaries and became an agent of the U.S. imperialists.

p. 87

⁴⁴ *La Bataille* (*The Battle*) — organ of the French anarcho-sindicalists, founded in Paris in November 1915. It adopted a social-chauvinist position in the imperialist world war (1914-18).

p. 90

